United Nations A/C.5/58/37

General Assembly

Distr.: General
19 April 2004

Original: English

Fifty-eighth session
Fifth Committee
Agenda item 134
Administrative and budgetary aspects of the financing of the United Nations peacekeeping operations: financing of the United Nations peacekeeping operations

Letter dated 12 March 2004 from the Chairman of the 2004 Working Group on Contingent-Owned Equipment to the Chairman of the Fifth Committee

In my capacity as Chairman of the 2004 Working Group on Contingent-Owned Equipment, I have the honour of transmitting to the Fifth Committee of the General Assembly the report of the Working Group dated 12 March 2004.

(*Signed*) Colonel Michael Edward **Hanrahan**
Chairman
2004 Working Group on Contingent-Owned Equipment

04-31397 (E) 240604

Contents

		Paragraphs	Page
I.	Introduction	1–21	4
II.	Summary of statements	22–24	7
	A. Statement by the Assistant Secretary-General	22–23	7
	B. Summary of discussions in the first plenary meeting	24	8
III.	Programme of work of the Working Group	25–27	8
	A. Election of Bureau members	25	8
	B. Adoption of the agenda	26	9
	C. Election of the Chairmen of the sub-working groups	27	9
IV.	Review of methodology, reimbursement rates and performance standards	28–78	10
	A. Major equipment	28–60	10
	B. Self-sustainment	61–75	15
	C. Medical support services	76	19
	D. Troop cost	77	19
	E. Other issues	78	19
V.	Closing remarks	79–80	19
	A. Concluding remarks by the Assistant Secretary-General	79	19
	B. Concluding remarks by the Chairman	80	20

Annexes

Major equipment

I.A.1	Triennial review of the reimbursement rates for major equipment and statistical model calculations	21
I.A.2	Explanatory remarks on the statistical model	38
I.A.3	Views expressed by one group of Member States on the review of reimbursement rates of major equipment	41
I.A.4	Views expressed by another group of Member States on the review of the reimbursement rates of major equipment	42
I.B.1	Amalgamation of commercial and military pattern support vehicles	43
I.B.2	Factors in deciding whether a commercial pattern support vehicle should be paid as a military pattern equivalent	46
I.B.3	Secretariat position on commercial and military pattern support vehicles	47
I.C.1	Major equipment: special cases	54
I.C.2	Reimbursement rate for new categories and subcategories of major equipment	55
I.C.3	Special cases under major equipment to be retained	58

I.C.4	Explosive ordnance disposal and demining equipment: special cases	61
I.C.5	Explosive ordnance disposal and demining: standards and definitions	64
I.C.6	Explosive ordnance disposal and demining: basic explosive ordnance disposal team equipment list	66
I.C.7	Major demining equipment requirements: generic demining platoon	71
I.C.8	International Mine Action Standard: personal protective equipment	73
I.C.9	Special cases: riot control equipment	81
I.D.1	Recommendation for refinement to current major equipment data-collection methodology	84
	Self-sustainment	
II.A.1	Triennial review of the reimbursement rates for self-sustainment and statistical model calculations	97
II.A.2	Views expressed by one group of Member States on the review of reimbursement rates on self-sustainment	119
II.A.3	Views expressed by another group of Member States in support of the adoption of a moderate increase in reimbursement rates, coupled with the adoption of a new methodology for calculating reimbursement rates	120
II.B	Recommendation for refinement to the current self-sustainment data-collection methodology	122
II.C	Frequency of verification reports of the contingent-owned equipment system	126
	Medical support services	
III.A	Views expressed by one group of Member States	128
III.B	Views expressed by another group of Member States	130
	Troop cost	
IV.	Summary of the sub-working group discussion on troop cost	133

I. Introduction

1. In its resolution 47/218 B of 14 September 1993, the General Assembly requested the Secretary-General to submit a comprehensive report on all issues that affect the successful operation and administration of peacekeeping operations.

2. In his report to the General Assembly dated 25 May 1994 (A/48/945 and Corr.1), the Secretary-General indicated that the procedures for determining reimbursement to Member States for contingent-owned equipment provided to peacekeeping missions had become overly cumbersome, both to the United Nations and to equipment-contributing countries (para. 82). The Secretary-General also suggested that established procedures for compensation to Member States for military contingent personnel could be used as a model.

3. In its resolution 49/233 of 23 December 1994, the General Assembly authorized the Secretary-General to proceed with the project, in accordance with the proposed timetable set out in the annex to the resolution, with a view to setting comprehensive standards for each category of equipment and establishing rates of reimbursement. The Secretary-General was to invite Member States, in particular troop-contributing countries, to participate in the process and to submit proposals for establishing new rates of reimbursement to the General Assembly for approval.

4. The Secretariat undertook to identify, as part of Phase I of the project, items of contingent-owned equipment for classification as either major or minor equipment by the Phase II Working Group. Under Phase II of the project, a Working Group consisting of technical experts from troop-contributing countries met from 27 March to 7 April 1995 to identify standards for major and minor equipment and consumables for which reimbursement would be authorized. The Working Group reached agreement that a force-leasing concept based on a wet or dry lease arrangement should be adopted for mission budgeting, expenditure control and cost-reimbursement purposes. It extended its review to consider a monthly dollar reimbursement rate linked to troop strength to cover self-sustainment costs and agreed that such costs were exclusive of the reimbursement rates approved by the General Assembly in its resolution 45/258 of 3 May 1991 (e.g., the $988 troop-cost reimbursement rate). The report of the Phase II Working Group was issued as the annex to document A/C.5/49/66 dated 2 May 1995 and highlights a series of required actions for discussion in Phase III of the project.

5. As recommended by the Phase II Working Group, an ad hoc working group, hosted by the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland and consisting of technical and financial experts from seven troop-contributing countries, met with Secretariat representatives in May 1995 to develop rates that could be considered by the Phase III Working Group.

6. Under Phase III of the project, a Working Group of financial and technical experts met from 10 to 20 July 1995 (see A/C.5/49/70) to consider the recommendations adopted by the Phase II Working Group, to review the rates of reimbursement proposed by the ad hoc working group and to make recommendations for comprehensive standards for which reimbursement would be authorized.

7. The results of the work of the Phase III Working Group were confirmed by an ad hoc working group, which met from 31 July to 4 August 1995. The group

compared the cost of the proposed system with the cost of the current one by using data on 12 contingents from 9 countries that had participated in peacekeeping operations during 1993 and 1994.

8. In his report dated 8 December 1995 (A/50/807), the Secretary-General recommended approval of most of the recommendations of the Phase II and Phase III Working Groups and, in respect of other items, made alternative recommendations for consideration by the General Assembly.

9. The General Assembly, in its resolution 50/222 of 11 April 1996, approved the report on the reform of the procedures for determining reimbursement to Member States for contingent-owned equipment and decided to review the operation of the revised procedures at its fifty-second session. It requested the Secretary-General to submit for its consideration a report on the first full year of implementation of the revised procedures. The Secretary-General in his report dated 7 October 1998 (A/53/465), reported that the Secretariat believed that the first full year of implementing the revised procedures had, to a large extent, accomplished the goals of simplifying the reimbursement process and providing the Organization with an essential planning and budgetary tool.

10. In its resolution 51/218 E of 17 June 1997, the General Assembly requested the Secretary-General to convene the Phase IV Working Group prior to submitting his report on the first full year of the implementation of revised procedures.

11. The purpose of the Phase IV Working Group was to review the rates published in the Phase III report and to facilitate the preparation of the report for the first year on the implementation of the revised procedures requested by the General Assembly, in keeping with resolution 51/218 E and pursuant to provisions contained in the report of the Phase III Working Group (A/C.5/49/70, para. 51 (c)), paragraphs 4 to 6 of General Assembly resolution 50/222 and section 1, paragraph 2, of General Assembly resolution 51/218 E.

12. The Secretariat presented issue papers to the Phase IV Working Group on the experience gained thus far in the implementation of the new procedures. By its resolution 54/19 dated 29 October 1999, the General Assembly endorsed the recommendations of the Phase IV Working Group (see A/C.5/52/39), as well as those of the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions with four exceptions (see A/53/944), and requested the Secretary-General to take all necessary measures to ensure the full participation of delegations in the work of the Phase V Working Group.

13. As requested by the General Assembly in its decision 53/480 of 8 June 1999, the Secretary-General convened the Phase V Working Group from 24 to 28 January 2000. Pursuant to General Assembly resolution 49/233, the mandate of the Phase V Working Group was to conduct a periodic review of the Phase II and Phase III standards. In addition, to facilitate these tasks, the Secretary-General proposed that a methodology be developed to ensure consistent application in future reviews. The report of the Phase V Working Group is contained in document A/C.5/54/59.

14. In accordance with its mandate, the Phase V Working Group proposed a methodology for the periodic revision of the rates in major equipment, self-sustainment and special cases, recommended improvements with regard to some performance standards and reimbursement procedures and, with the exception of the

amendments in paragraph 86 (a) to (l) of the report, adopted the Secretary-General's proposal on medical support services.

15. By its resolution 54/19 B of 15 June 2000, the General Assembly endorsed the recommendation of the Phase V Working Group. It decided to convene, in accordance with annex IX to the report of the Phase V Working Group (A/C.5/54/49), a post-Phase V Working Group in January and February 2001. The Group would determine an appropriate average index to be applied to the existing major equipment rates, and those for self-sustainment and medical support services. To this effect, the Assembly requested Member States to provide data pertaining to major equipment and self-sustainment, including the cost of painting and repainting of major equipment, by 31 October 2000 at the latest, in order for the Secretariat to report to the General Assembly in November 2000 on the adequacy, or otherwise, of the data. The Secretary-General, in his note dated 29 November 2000 (A/55/650), reported that the Secretariat had received data from 30 Member States and that the Secretariat was of the opinion that the data was sufficient for the post-Phase V Working Group to conduct a further analysis.

16. In its resolution 55/229 of 23 December 2000, the General Assembly reviewed the note by the Secretary-General on the review of the rates of reimbursement of troop-contributing States and requested the post-Phase V Working Group to consider the current methodology underlying the calculations of standard rates of reimbursement to troop-contributing States, including ways to produce timely and more representative data.

17. The post-Phase V Working Group met from 15 to 26 January 2001 and performed the first triennial review reimbursement rate review, based on national cost data received from Member States from 1996 to 1999, in accordance with annex I to document A/C.5/54/49. Given variations in the index data received from Member States, it was agreed that a statistical tool should be used. Calculations were done using a standard deviation as the statistical tool to make it possible to compare averages. The statistical tool led to an increase of 7.426848 per cent, measured on the budgetary impact, in the reimbursement rates of major equipment and self-sustainment. The Working Group also updated the standards of major equipment, self-sustainment and medical support services, as well as provisions on liability for damage to major equipment used by one country and owned by another. It also recommended standard painting and repainting rates for major equipment, and a new self-sustainment rate for the provision of combined level II and III medical support services. During its deliberations, the post-Phase V Working Group could not reach consensus on a methodology for review of troop-cost reimbursement and recommended that the General Assembly consider all aspects of the methodologies set up in the two proposals contained in its report.

18. By its resolution 55/274, the General Assembly endorsed the recommendations of the post-Phase V Working Group as contained in its report dated 7 March 2001 (A/C.5/55/39), requested the Secretary-General to submit to the General Assembly for its approval at its resumed fifty-sixth session a methodology for reimbursement for troop cost, covering troops and formed police unit and a questionnaire to be submitted to troop-contributing countries, and decided to increase, on an interim and ad hoc basis, the standard rate of reimbursement for troop costs to troop-contributing countries by 2 per cent, effective 1 July 2001 and to further increase an additional 2 per cent as of 1 January 2002. The Assembly also requested the

Secretary-General to convene in 2004 an open-ended working group of experts, for a period of no less than ten working days, to hold a triennial review of reimbursement rates for contingent-owned equipment and self-sustainment, including medical services.

19. By its resolutions 57/321 and 57/314 of 18 June 2003, the General Assembly requested the Working Group to consider the proposed methodology of troop cost contained in the report of the Secretary-General, and requested the Secretariat to submit a comprehensive report, taking into account the observations of the Advisory Committee and based on the experience gained so far, and make suggestions for any modification to the current reporting cycle to the 2004 Working Group on Contingent-Owned Equipment scheduled for February 2004.

20. The Working Group was presented with a number of issue papers by various Member States and the Secretariat. The issue papers were referred to the sub-working groups for consideration. The present report summarizes the discussions and the key recommendations of the Working Group. Where consensus was not reached in the Working Group, views of various groups of Member States are issued as annexes to the report. The information contained in the annexes to the present report provides additional rationale and technical considerations and, as such, constitutes essential complimentary data upon which the recommendations should be analysed and implemented. The Working Group addressed the issues, grouped into four areas: major equipment, self-sustainment, troop costs and medical support services, each dealt with by a sub-working group, and made recommendations thereon.

21. The recommendations contained in this report must be read in conjunction with the recommendations contained in the Phase II, III, IV, V and post-Phase V reports. In some cases, the recommendations in the present report supplement and/or supersede those contained in the previous reports.

II. Summary of statements

A. Statement by the Assistant Secretary-General

22. In her opening statement, the Assistant Secretary-General for Peacekeeping Operations welcomed the delegates. She indicated that further progress had to be made on the rates of reimbursement, specifically troop costs and medical support. There has been a significant change in United Nations peacekeeping since the last meeting of the Working Group on Contingent-Owned Equipment in January 2001: the change in security environment demanded more robust United Nations peacekeeping.

23. The Assistant Secretary-General outlined five issues to highlight the changing environment. First, there is a need to close the gap between what is contained in the signed memorandum of understanding in New York City and what is actually delivered by nations on the ground in a mission area. Second, the United Nations and the troop-contributing countries must help each other in the sustainment of forces. Thirdly, multidimensional peacekeeping missions within a region may offer potential economy of scale savings. These economies must, however, ensure that operational requirements of each specific mission can still be met. Fourthly, it is

essential that the United Nations reintroduce standards in key areas such as health, safety and security. Lastly, the distribution of labour between those that pay versus those who operate on the ground in missions must be balanced. Expectations must be managed; the United Nations must be efficient and effective, but it must also accomplish its mandate and tasks.

B. Summary of discussions in the first plenary meeting

24. The representatives of Japan, Bangladesh, Ireland, South Africa, Jordan, India, Canada, the United Kingdom, Poland, Nepal, Germany and Denmark made statements. The Secretariat was complimented for its efforts in putting together the background papers. Following are key points made by the speakers at the first plenary meeting:

(a) A number of nations stressed that 2004 contingent-owned equipment review exercise should be objective and linked to the actual incremental changes in the cost of contingent-owned equipment and other factors of peacekeeping and should not be influenced by United Nations peacekeeping budgetary concerns;

(b) The report of the Secretary-General, dated 3 April 2002, on the review of rates of reimbursement to the Governments of troop-contributing States (A/57/774), falls significantly short of the request contained in paragraph 8 of General Assembly resolution 55/274 of 14 June 2001, as it adds isolated new variables to the methodology without detailed explanation;

(c) The major equipment and self-sustainment rate review methodology was validated by the post-Phase V Working Group of 2001 and approved by the General Assembly, as a comprehensive and sound basis for the current triennial review by the 2004 Working Group on Contingent-Owned Equipment;

(d) Some nations raised reservations with respect to the present contingent-owned equipment cost data-collection methodology, as there is currently no direct comparison made between national cost data and actual United Nations reimbursement rates;

(e) The priority of work for the 2004 Working Group on Contingent-Owned Equipment should be the primary agenda items of rate review with issue papers being dealt with after rates have been reviewed.

III. Programme of work of the Working Group

A. Election of Bureau members

25. Colonel Michael Edward Hanrahan (Canada) was elected Chairman of the 2004 Working Group on Contingent-Owned Equipment by consensus. On a request for nominations, Colonel Ibrahim Jamal (Bangladesh) and Colonel George Owino (Kenya) were elected by acclamation as Vice-Chairman and Rapporteur, respectively.

B. Adoption of the agenda

26. The Working Group adopted the following provisional agenda for its session (23 February to 5 March 2004) for the four sub-working groups:

Major equipment

(a) Triennial review of reimbursement rates of major equipment with national cost data;

(b) Review of reimbursement rates of support vehicles: commercial and military patterned vehicles;

(c) Review of list of special cases and recommendation of standard reimbursement rates for new categories and subcategories and a threshold value for special cases of major equipment;

(d) Examination of proposed changes to the methodology for the review of reimbursement rates for major equipment.

Self-sustainment

(a) Triennial review of reimbursement rates of self-sustainment with national cost data;

(b) Examination of proposed changes to the methodology for the review of reimbursement rates for self-sustainment;

(c) Review of an annual mechanism to provide guidance and decision-making on contingent-owned equipment;

(d) Review of the frequency of verification reports of contingent-owned equipment in field missions.

Medical support services

(a) Review of the modular medical concept paper;

(b) Review of the national cost data for pharmaceuticals;

(c) Review of the cost for predeployment, vaccination and medical self-sustainment.

Troop cost

Review of the methodology for reimbursement of troop costs contained in the report of the Secretary-General (A/57/774), as requested by the General Assembly in its resolution 57/321.

C. Election of the Chairmen of the sub-working groups

27. The discussions were initially conducted in four separate sub-working groups on the following subjects: major equipment, self-sustainment, medical support services and troop cost. The Chairman announced the election of the following delegates to chair the deliberations in the four sub-working groups:

(a) Major equipment: Lt. Colonel Claus Uttrup Pedersen (Denmark)

(b) Self-sustainment: Colonel Eduardo Devercelli (Uruguay)

(c) Medical support services: Lt. Col. VO Osabutey-Anikon (Ghana)

(d) Troop cost: Commander Dirk Lewyllie (Belgium)

IV. Review of methodology, reimbursement rates and performance standards

A. Major equipment

28. The Sub-Working Group considered the following four issues relating to major equipment and it was decided, by consensus, to nominate the following focal points for coordinating the issues:

(a) Triennial review of reimbursement rates of major equipment with national cost data: Denmark (supported by Austria and Jordan);

(b) Review of reimbursement rates of support vehicles: commercial and military patterned vehicles: United Kingdom (supported by Bangladesh, Finland and India);

(c) Special cases;

(i) New categories/subcategories and threshold value for major equipment: Poland (supported by Fiji, Ghana, Italy, Kenya, and Norway);

(ii) Demining and explosive ordnance disposal equipment: Slovakia (supported by Sweden);

(iii) Riot control equipment: Austria (supported by New Zealand and Slovakia);

(d) Proposed changes to the methodology for review of reimbursement rates for major equipment: Canada.

1. Triennial review of the reimbursement rates of major equipment

29. In April 2003, the Secretariat requested all Member States to submit their data and indices for the 2004 triennial review before the end of December 2003. The 2004 Working Group has conducted the second triennial review of reimbursement rates of major equipment, based on data submitted by 25 Member States for the period from 1 January 2000 to 31 December 2002.

30. During the Working Group meetings, it was revealed that only a few delegates had detailed knowledge on how the statistical model works. Thus, much time was spent explaining the model to delegations. It was also revealed that some nations could have submitted blank fields, instead of a zero, to indicate that no change to the rate should be made. Some delegates also realized that the impact of not having submitted data, instead of submitting zeros, if they wanted the rates to be as they were, was of far-reaching importance.

31. The established statistical analysis methodology was applied to evolve a set of four representative values (see annex I.A.1), which ranged in budgetary impact from

11.09 to 6.8 per cent. From the statistical point of view, the result giving the least impact on the United Nations budget (i.e., 6.8 per cent), used more than 90 per cent of the submitted data.

32. A group of Member States stated that the existing methodology for submission of data and the actual process of reviewing the reimbursement rates had been established by mutual consensus in the Phase V Working Group in January 2000 and approved by the General Assembly, and must be used. As a compromise, those Member Sates that fully supported the current model agreed to the lowest rate suggested by the statistical model, that is, 6.8 per cent, and made the following recommendations:

(a) The existing model is based on sound statistical logic and enjoys the consensus of the last Working Group and the approval of the General Assembly. Any changes should only be allowed through established channels, that is, a recommendation to the General Assembly made by the Working Group through the Fifth Committee;

(b) The submitted issue paper on refining data collection should be treated as a proposal only;

(c) The process of either adopting or not adopting "any" data-based methodology should also be addressed. Based on the fact that some Member States are willing to ignore completely an established methodology, the question of considering a new methodology becomes irrelevant;

(d) For all practical purposes of this Working Group, no departure should be allowed from the approved and adopted methodology;

(e) Any negotiations concerning the rates of reimbursement should be within the range established by the existing statistical model.

33. This group of Member States expressed their disappointment with the fact that the only offer on the table during the Working Group meeting was a rate that would give an overall impact on the United Nations budget of not more that 0.5 per cent.

34. Another group of Member States took the position that the current methodology is flawed and requires refinement. In addition, those Member States expressed the view that the Working Group should also take into account the impact of these statistical results on the United Nations peacekeeping budget. Their concerns are as follows:

(a) Some of these Member States cited misunderstandings related to how various submissions, including null, zero, or blank data fields, were factored into the results. Several countries noted that the non-submission of data was a deliberate decision to indicate satisfaction with the status quo. The Secretariat advised that countries that did not submit data were not factored into the final results. The concerned Member States felt that this indicated that the methodology was flawed;

(b) Others in this group noted that the values compiled by the Secretariat as per the Phase V Working Group report represented the percentage change in national costs and not the actual monetary value change and, as such, did not reflect the actual change in Member State costs in comparison to the existing United Nations reimbursement rate. In their view, this also indicated a flaw in the

methodology that rendered the results unsuitable to establish a new reimbursement rate.

35. No consensus could be reached in the Working Group in regard to the triennial review of reimbursement rates for major equipment. Views of various Member States are attached as annexes I.A.3 and I.A.4.

Recommendations

No recommendations were made.

2. Support vehicles: amalgamation of commercial and military patterns

36. The amalgamation of commercial and military pattern support vehicles had two main issues to be addressed, which revolve around the differences between a commercial and military pattern support vehicle:

(a) Where different rates for commercial and military rates are to be maintained, then the definitions as contained in the 2002 Contingent-Owned Equipment Manual at paragraph 34 of annex A to chapter 3, had to be analysed and agreed on;

(b) In the event that there is little difference between the two types, then the method of amalgamation had to be addressed and rates agreed on.

37. The Working Group therefore analysed the definitions of the existing commercial and military pattern vehicles, and developed a checklist to determine whether a commercial pattern vehicle could qualify for a military pattern rate of reimbursement. The Secretariat found that the list could be helpful to distinguish between the two categories of vehicles. The Working Group found that the variation in capacities, capabilities and the cost of the two types of vehicles are too much to amalgamate the two categories of support vehicles.

Recommendations

38. The Working Group made the following recommendations:

(a) **Consensus was reached on the issue of a further definition of when a commercial pattern vehicle could be reimbursed as a military pattern vehicle;**

(b) **The agreed checklist (annex I.B.2) should be adopted where there is a military pattern equivalent and included in future versions of the Contingent-Owned Equipment Manual;**

(c) **The Secretariat should begin an information-gathering process culminating in the presentation of the results at the 2007 Working Group. The information should provide evidence of how the new standard is being applied and should also provide an analysis of how reimbursement would have been applied under the old standard (see annex I.B.1 for detailed discussions);**

(d) **Member States should discuss and recommend any further changes in the 2007 Working Group.**

3. Review of the list of special cases

39. Four sub-issues of special cases were addressed, as follows:

(a) Categorization of residual special cases for the period 1996-2003 inclusive, as provided by the Secretariat;

(b) Establishment of a threshold value;

(c) Explosive ordnance disposal and demining equipment;

(d) Riot control equipment.

(a) Categorization of residual special cases for the period 1996-2003 inclusive, as provided by the Secretariat

40. As it is in the interests of all Member States to reduce workload and delays in signing the memorandum of understanding, the number of special cases should be reduced by adding or changing standard categories/subcategories of major equipment.

41. A list of all special cases approved by the Secretariat in the period 1996-2003 have been extensively studied, with the objective of creating new standard categories that can reduce the number of special cases in the future. The Working Group decided that major equipment in a standard category should be of similar functions, capacities, generic fair market value, useful life and maintenance cost rate. The Working Group was supported by data provided by Member States and the Secretariat and was assisted by specialists from the Secretariat. Details of the discussions are contained in annex I.C.1.

Recommendations

42. **A number of new standard categories/subcategories should be added to the list of major equipment (see annex I.C.2).**

43. **The equipment on the list of special cases should remain as special cases in the future. An updated list is attached as annex I.C.3.**

(b) Threshold value

44. It was pointed out by the Secretariat that a great deal of resources was spent dealing with special cases with a rather low generic fair market value.

45. The Working Group confirmed that special cases should be reserved for major equipment of high generic fair market value and a long useful life, but also realized that there was a lack of a clear definition of what divided major equipment from minor equipment.

46. Some Member States were concerned about the impact of having a threshold value and therefore requested that the threshold value instituted should be revised by the next working group, based on experiences gathered by the Secretariat in the intervening period.

Recommendations

47. **A threshold should be established at: the generic fair market value of an item or set (collective value of all items in the set) is higher than US$ 500 and the life expectancy of an item or set is greater than one year.**

48. **The threshold value should be reviewed during the scheduled Contingent-Owned Equipment meeting in 2007.**

49. **The Secretariat should be mandated to maintain a database of special cases to assist in future reviews.**

50. **In a spirit of simplicity and reasonability, the Working Group encourages Member States to limit the number of special cases submitted to the Secretariat.**

(c) Explosive ordnance disposal and demining equipment

51. There is an operational need for the deployment of explosive ordnance disposal and demining capabilities at the force level, however, these requirements are not clearly defined and equipment is not specified in the Contingent-Owned Equipment Manual. See annex I.C.4 for a summary of the deliberations.

Recommendations

52. **Explosive ordnance disposal and demining equipment should be identified as a specific category within the reimbursements rates for major equipment for explosive ordnance disposal and demining units with force-level responsibilities (see annex I.C.2, p. 2, for details on categories, subcategories, generic fair market value rates, etc.).**

53. **Definitions and standards of explosive ordnance disposal and demining equipment and protective clothing should be added to the Contingent-Owned Equipment Manual (see annexes I.C.5 and I.C.8).**

54. **The explosive ordnance disposal generic team and platoon structure and list of equipment for operational deployment identified by the Working Group should be added to the Contingent-Owned Equipment Manual, in order to facilitate force generation process. For details on explosive ordnance disposal team structure and equipment, see annexes I.C.6 and I.C.7.**

55. **The operational requirement for dogs, expensive demining equipment and additional operational requirements should be negotiated within the memorandum of understanding signed by Member States and the United Nations.**

(d) Riot control equipment

56. This equipment is currently listed as a "special case" in some missions where military contingents are required to hold stocks of these items. It is therefore desirable to place these items as generic standard elements within major equipment (see annex I.C.9 for detailed discussions).

Recommendations

57. **Riot control equipment should be placed as a specific category within reimbursable major equipment. The category should consist of three serials of equipment (i.e., personal set, platoon set and company set). For details on categories, generic fair market value rates, etc., see annex I.C.2, page 3.**

58. **Any additional operationally required items are to be negotiated within memorandums of understanding signed by Member States and the United Nations.**

4. Refinement of methodology

59. It should be understood that no model nor methodology is likely to be perfect, given the number of countries involved and the quite different capabilities and cost structures that influence the results of any methodology. As such, the model or models adopted should be used as a decision support tool that the Working Group can use in combination with other relevant factors to evaluate the validity and equity of reimbursement rates.

60. No consensus could be reached on refining the current contingent-owned equipment methodology for major equipment. Views of some Member States on this issue are contained in annex I.D.1.

Recommendations

No recommendations were made.

B. Self-sustainment

61. The Sub-Working Group considered four issues relating to self-sustainment and it was decided, by consensus, to nominate the following focal points for coordinating the issues:

(a) Triennial review of reimbursement rates of self-sustainment with national cost data: Netherlands and Denmark;

(b) Proposed changes to the methodology for the review of reimbursement rates for self-sustainment: Canada;

(c) Mechanism to provide guidance and decision-making on the contingent-owned equipment system: Australia;

(d) Frequency of verification reports of contingent-owned equipment: New Zealand.

1. Triennial review of reimbursement rates

62. In April 2003, the Secretariat sent questionnaires to Member States for the purpose of collecting data for the recalculation of the rates for major equipment and self-sustainment. Data for self-sustainment was received from 24 Member States.

63. The statistical method of calculation of new rates is based on the comparison of national data for one period with national data of another period. Some Member

States indicated that investigations showed that the data collected could not be linked to the value of the existing rates.

64. After intensive discussion, it became clear that some Member States had lost faith in the results of running the statistic model and therefore no consensus over the thus calculated new rates could be reached.

65. Some Member States agreed that the United Nations Secretariat should make clear to all Member States that, when submitting data to the 2007 Working Group on Contingent-Owned Equipment for inclusion in the statistical analysis under the current methodology, Member States should be aware that there were three distinct positions that could be adopted when inputting data into the statistical model, namely:

(a) Inputting numeric data;

(b) Inputting a zero percentage, indicating no increase in costs of that Member State's equipment in these categories and/or contentment with current rates;

(c) Where data does not exist, or has not been submitted, it will be interpreted as "not applicable (N/A)" in the statistical model and will thus have no bearing on the final outcome.

66. A group of Member States took the following position:

(a) They insisted that the existing methodology for submission of data and the actual process of reviewing the reimbursement rates as established by mutual consensus in the Phase V Working Group in February 2000 and approved by the General Assembly be applied to determine the rate;

(b) The statistical analysis methodology was used to evolve a set of four representative values that ranged in budgetary impact from 8.34 to 4.86 per cent (see annex II.A.1). As a compromise, the Member States agreed to accept the lowest rate suggested by the approved model, that is, 4.86 per cent;

(c) In view of the foregoing, this group tabled the following recommendations:

(i) The existing model is based on sound statistical logic and enjoys the consensus of the last Working Group and approval of the General Assembly. Any changes should only be allowed through established channels, that is, a recommendation made by the Working Group to the General Assembly through the Fifth Committee;

(ii) The issue paper submitted on data collection by a nation should be treated as a proposal only;

(iii) The process of either adopting or not adopting "any" data-based methodology should also be addressed. Based on the fact that some Member States are willing to ignore completely an established methodology, the question of considering a new methodology becomes irrelevant;

(iv) For all practical purposes of this Working Group, no departure should be allowed from the approved and adopted methodology;

(v) Any negotiations concerning the rates of reimbursement should be within the range established by the existing statistical model.

67. Another group of Member States had the following view:

(a) The post-Phase V Working Group in 2001 recommended, with certain reservations (para. 72 of A/C.5/55/39 dated 7 March 2001) that a form of statistical methodology be used as a basis for future rate changes. The post-Phase V Working Group also suggested that, in future Working Groups should pursue the establishment of more effective and robust guidelines to provide a clearer description of the sample force to be used by all Member States and the formulation of proposed rates for the future (see annex II.A). It is also important to note that the 2001 Working Group had noted that some delegates expressed concern that the guidelines for the sample force provided by the Phase V Working Group to be used as a standard in the formulation of proposed rates lacked clarity, which may have caused Member States to submit imprecise calculations. This methodology had been reached only after "significant discussion" (see A/C.5/55/39, paras. 70 and 72);

(b) The difficulties that appeared to have taken root during the 2001 Working Group meeting were reflected during the discussions at the 2004 Working Group. These revolved primarily around the following issues:

(i) The data submitted only reflects national percentage cost increases and decreases, that is, national cost in 2000 compared with 2002. This figure bore no relationship to the current United Nations rate of reimbursement. This was not in the spirit of the costing guidelines laid down in paragraphs 75 (a) and (b) and in annex II.A to document A/C.5/55/39;

(ii) Generally speaking, across all categories, data was only submitted by less than 25 per cent of Member States and was therefore considered to be unrepresentative of the total number;

(iii) There was confusion as to the significance of Member States' submitting a zero value to express their acknowledgement and contentment that there should be no increase or decrease in the current reimbursement rates. As a result, many Member States did not submit data; this had been reflected in the model as "N/A" and therefore had no statistical value in the model;

(c) To agree to only a moderate increase in reimbursement rates (not exceeding 1 per cent this time;

(d) Any increase in reimbursement rates must be accompanied by an agreement by all Member States to proceed with work on proposals to refine the method of collecting data for the 2007 Working Group. This additional data should be collected in parallel with the current methodology but should not negate any other proposals from other Member States to refine or modify the methodology;

(e) That Member States should be advised of the following options when submitting data:

(i) Submit normal data;

(ii) Submit a zero value to express a Member State's satisfaction with the current reimbursement rates. This will therefore effect the statistical analysis, since zero is a value;

(iii) Submit no data that will be reflected in the model as "not applicable (N/A)", as this will have no effect on the statistical analysis.

68. No consensus on the review of triennial self-sustainment rates was reached by the Working Group. The views of the various groups of Member States are contained in annexes II.A.2 and II.A.3.

Recommendations

No recommendations were made.

2. Refinement of methodology

69. The Working Group deliberated on the issue of refinement of methodology. However, due to extremely divergent views from Member States, there was no consensus. The views of some Member States are contained in annex II.B.

Recommendations

No recommendations were made.

3. Mechanism to provide guidance and decisions on the contingent-owned equipment system

70. The contingent-owned equipment system review mechanism allows for a formal review of reimbursement rates on a triennial basis. Currently, there is no formal mechanism to review the administrative aspects of the system on a more frequent basis. Recent experience in United Nations peacekeeping operations, particularly those gained during the Partners in Peacekeeping Conference held in Sierra Leone from 3 to 5 March 2003, indicates that a range of issues should be addressed on a more frequent basis with a view to improving the overall administration of the system.

71. A number of options were explored but no consensus was reached on the issue.

Recommendations

No recommendations were made.

4. Frequency of verification of reports

72. The Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions recommended in its report (A/57/772) that the Secretariat provide briefing information and a paper to the 2004 Working Group on Contingent-Owned Equipment on the experience to date in implementing the current cycle for processing verification reports.

73. The Secretariat indicated that the most cost-effective process is for verification reports to be provided by field missions to United Nations Headquarters on a quarterly basis. The reports would be compiled drawing on the data contained in the troop-contributing countries and police-contributing countries contingent standard monthly returns to field mission force headquarters, results of spot-check inspections, arrival, quarterly and repatriation inspections and the six monthly operational readiness inspections (see annex II.C for a summary of the discussions).

Recommendations

74. **In the future, verification reports should be completed by United Nations field missions and forwarded to United Nations Headquarters on a quarterly basis.**

75. **The Contingent-Owned Equipment Manual should be amended to reflect that verification reporting is to be on a quarterly basis and that troop-contributing country and police-contributing country contingents must adhere to United Nations field mission operational, logistical and administrative standard operating procedures and administrative instructions.**

C. Medical support services

76. No consensus was reached in the Working Group. Annexes III.A and III.B contain the views expressed by various groups of Member States.

Recommendations

No recommendations were made.

D. Troop cost

77. No consensus was reached in the Working Group. Annex IV contains a summary of the Working Group's discussion on troop cost.

Recommendations

No recommendations were made.

E. Other issues

78. The Working Group considers it important that the Contingent-Owned Equipment Manual be available in all six official languages of the Organization and, therefore, recommends its distribution as an official United Nations document.

Recommendations

The Contingent-Owned Equipment Manual should be distributed as an official United Nations document.

V. Closing remarks

A. Concluding remarks by the Assistant Secretary-General

79. The Assistant Secretary-General for Peacekeeping Operations, thanked the delegations for providing guidance to the Secretariat on the Contingent-Owned Equipment system.

B. Concluding remarks by the Chairman

80. The Chairman of the 2004 Working Group on Contingent-Owned Equipment, stated that the Group had not achieved consensus on its primary agenda items on rate review. Consensus had been achieved on a variety of technical issues that should enhance the contingent-owned equipment system. The Chairman thanked the participants for the results achieved in the present session of the Working Group and thanked the Secretariat for the support provided.

Annex I.A.1

Triennial review of the reimbursement rates for major equipment and statistical model calculations

Background

1. The methodology on reformed procedures for determining reimbursement to Member States for contingent-owned equipment, was developed by the post-Phase V Working Group and recommended by it in its report dated 7 March 2001 (A/C.5/55/39).

2. By its resolution 55/274 of 14 June 2001, the General Assembly endorsed the recommendations of the post-Phase V Working Group.

3. The post-Phase V Working Group conducted the first triennial review of reimbursement rates of major equipment using the methodology.

4. In April 2003, the Secretariat requested Member States to submit their data and indices for the 2004 triennial review before the end of December. A reminder was sent out in December. Before the session of the 2004 Working Group on Contingent-Owned Equipment, 32 Member States had submitted data.

Discussion

5. During the session of the 2004 Working Group on Contingent-Owned Equipment, it was revealed that only a few delegates had detailed knowledge on how the statistical model works and much time was thus spent explaining the model to delegations. For the future use of the model, it is essential that full documentation be available to facilitate those who will use the model in the future.

6. It was also revealed that some nations could have submitted blank fields, instead of a zero, to indicate that no change to the rate should be made. Some delegates also realized that the impact of not having submitted data instead of submitting zeros, if they wanted the rates to remain as they are, was of far-reaching importance. No Member State, except Italy, wanted to change their "blanks" to zeros, and Italy only wanted to change it in one field. That correction was accepted by the Working Group.

7. The Working Group decided that no additional Member States could be allowed to submit data after the session of the Working Group as this would not be consistent with the review model approved by the General Assembly.

8. The Working Group made an audit of the data provided by the Secretariat, to ensure that the data provided by troop-contributing countries had been treated in the right way, had found its way onto the spreadsheet and that no other data had been included in the sheet. A few corrections were made and all data presented to and discussed with the Member States that had provided the original data.

9. The 2004 Working Group conducted the second triennial review of reimbursement rates of major equipment, based on data (group index per category) submitted by Member States for the period from 1 January 2000 to 31 December 2002.

10. The methodology used to revise the reimbursement rates for major equipment is based on a model, taking into account the very wide range of data provided by

Member States. However, the methodology prevents extremely high or low indices from having an impact on the final result, by using a statistical model when computing the data. Results of the calculations are presented in the attached spreadsheets.

11. Discussions were held on which cut was the "correct" one. There is no optimum or correct cut. However is it the overall idea of the model to reduce the uncertainty in the calculation of new major equipment indices? An optimum should be sought where the standard deviation is minimized, as long as the number of Member States that submitted the data included in the actual cuts calculation, does not fall below 50 per cent in each and every subcategory of all data submitted in the subcategory.

12. As the maximum standard deviation is just above 20 per cent, the first cut is 20 per cent. Cuts were calculated on 20, 15, 10 and 5 percent. The cut of 5 per cent cannot be used, as the number of used data in a subcategory will drop below 50 per cent. From a statistical point, the most certain result is the "cut 15", as more than 90 per cent of the data submitted is used, which is a good percentage. The percentage of data used will start to decrease rapidly if a lower cut is adopted. At "cut 10", the data used dropped to 77 per cent in one category.

13. Some delegations took the position that the Working Group should also take into account the dramatic impact on the United Nations budget if rates were to be increased. This should be kept in focus when the Working Group makes recommendation on the "cut", and thereby also on the recommended change in the reimbursement rate.

14. After some exchange of viewpoints it was decided that if this or other concerns should have an impact on the future rates in a more extended manner not covered by the statistical model, it should be left open for the 2007 Working Group to discuss.

15. The statistical model should be used as a decision-making support tool by the Working Group.

Recommendations

16. No recommendations could be reached in the Working Group.

Statistical Model Calculations
(NO CUT)

SERIAL	GENERIC CATEGORY OF EQUIPMENT	ARGENTINA	AUSTRIA	BANGLADESH	BRAZIL	BURKINA FASO	CANADA	CHINA	DENMARK	FRANCE	INDIA	ITALY	JAPAN	JORDAN
(a)	(b)													
1.	Communication Equipment Includes VHF/UHF /FM Transceivers and HF Equipment	N/A	N/A	30.00%	4.00%	7.00%	23.64%	2.00%	6.22%	2.00%	19.00%	7.17%	0.00%	7.52%
2.	Satellite Equipment	N/A	1.61%	28.00%	2.00%	N/A	N/A	2.00%	6.22%	2.00%	22.00%	9.13%	N/A	0.00%
3.	Telephone Equipment	N/A	N/A	28.00%	2.00%	N/A	-33.69%	2.00%	6.22%	2.00%	26.00%	16.59%	0.00%	7.52%
4.	Airfield Support Equipment	N/A	N/A	5.00%	N/A	N/A	11.10%	2.00%	6.22%	2.00%	20.00%	4.02%	-5.10%	0.00%
5.	Miscellaneous	N/A	N/A	29.00%	N/A	N/A	17.80%	2.00%	6.22%	2.00%	N/A	2.91%	-9.70%	0.00%
6.	Generators (Stationary & Mobile)	N/A	0.41%	25.00%	0.00%	7.00%	-31.27%	2.00%	6.22%	2.00%	19.00%	11.15%	N/A	4.12%
7.	Engineering	N/A	1.61%	26.00%	5.00%	N/A	0.08%	2.00%	6.22%	2.00%	19.00%	2.29%	1.10%	2.35%
8.	Logistic Equipment	N/A	1.61%	30.00%	5.00%	N/A	17.23%	2.00%	6.22%	2.00%	19.00%	2.16%	N/A	0.00%
9.	Demining Equipment	N/A	N/A	30.00%	0.00%	N/A	N/A	2.00%	6.22%	2.00%	N/A	0.00%	N/A	0.00%
10.	Medical and Dental Equipment	N/A	N/A	5.00%	2.00%	10.00%	N/A	2.00%	6.22%	2.00%	N/A	3.46%	3.10%	3.69%
11.	Area Equipment	N/A	N/A	30.00%	5.00%	N/A	N/A	2.00%	6.22%	2.00%	N/A	2.13%	-2.20%	0.00%
12.	Personal Equipment	N/A	3.58%	30.00%	2.50%	2.00%	-23.16%	2.00%	6.22%	2.00%	N/A	4.50%	-25.27%	0.00%
13.	Accommodation Equipment Includes Semi-Rigid and Rigid Structures	N/A	1.61%	5.00%	0.00%	N/A	-54.92%	2.00%	6.22%	2.00%	20.00%	2.13%	7.00%	0.00%
14.	Containers	N/A	N/A	30.00%	3.00%	N/A	-1.02%	2.00%	6.22%	2.00%	N/A	3.45%	N/A	4.25%
15.	Armaments	7.14%	3.58%	30.00%	3.00%	1.00%	0.00%	2.00%	6.22%	2.00%	20.00%	2.01%	0.60%	3.60%
16.	Combat Vehicles	N/A	1.61%	30.00%	3.00%	N/A	-18.55%	2.00%	6.22%	2.00%	16.00%	2.47%	-10.20%	9.56%
17.	Support Vehicles (Commercial Pattern)	N/A	-6.41%	N/A	3.50%	7.80%	-3.53%	2.00%	6.22%	2.00%	20.00%	0.24%	-21.30%	6.18%
18.	Support Vehicles (Military Pattern, Includes. PLS)	22.00%	-6.41%	30.00%	3.50%	6.25%	4.32%	2.00%	6.22%	2.00%	18.00%	16.67%	-5.00%	7.18%
19.	Communication Vehicles	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	6.20%	N/A	2.00%	6.22%	2.00%	22.00%	1.90%	N/A	0.00%
20.	Engineering Vehicles	N/A	-4.00%	30.00%	4.00%	N/A	-1.16%	2.00%	6.22%	2.00%	24.00%	11.76%	-0.90%	3.81%
21.	Material Handling Equipment	N/A	N/A	30.00%	3.00%	N/A	-8.09%	2.00%	6.22%	2.00%	20.00%	5.30%	-35.70%	3.80%
22.	Aircraft Support Equipment	N/A	1.61%	5.00%	N/A	N/A	6.12%	2.00%	6.22%	2.00%	20.00%	5.21%	N/A	0.00%
23.	Trailers	13.51%	-10.51%	30.00%	2.50%	N/A	9.39%	2.00%	6.22%	2.00%	19.00%	2.22%	7.20%	4.25%
24.	POL	3.30%	N/A	N/A	0.00%	N/A	-27.33%	2.00%	6.22%	2.00%	N/A	1.61%	N/A	5.22%

Statistical Model Calculations
(NO CUT)

SERIAL	GENERIC CATEGORY OF EQUIPMENT	PAKISTAN	POLAND	RUSSIA	SLOVAKIA	SWEDEN	THAILAND	TUNISIA	TURKEY	UKRAINE	URUGUAY	ZAMBIA	ZIMBABWE
(a)	(b)												
1.	Communication Equipment Includes VHF/AM/ -FM Transceivers and HF Equipment	21.00%	N/A	27.00%	5.47%	4.60%	8.84%	N/A	-0.06%	37.02%	N/A	9.00%	0.30%
2.	Satellite Equipment	N/A	N/A	27.00%	N/A	10.00%	N/A	N/A	3.29%	N/A	13.62%	9.00%	N/A
3.	Telephone Equipment	N/A	8.00%	27.00%	N/A	4.60%	8.60%	N/A	-4.48%	13.32%	N/A	9.00%	N/A
4.	Airfield Support Equipment	N/A	N/A	31.00%	N/A	9.90%	N/A	N/A	24.58%	N/A	N/A	0.00%	N/A
5.	Miscellaneous	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	4.60%	N/A	N/A	-2.62%	N/A	N/A	-30.00%	N/A
6.	Generators (Stationary & Mobile)	N/A	0.00%	28.00%	11.16%	4.60%	7.23%	37.50%	10.91%	20.32%	1.88%	2.00%	N/A
7.	Engineering	21.00%	0.90%	37.00%	N/A	4.60%	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	7.15%	0.00%	N/A
8.	Logistic Equipment	N/A	N/A	29.00%	N/A	4.60%	N/A	N/A	N/A	15.00%	2.50%	0.00%	N/A
9.	Demining Equipment	N/A	N/A	37.00%	21.31%	4.60%	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	0.00%	N/A
10.	Medical and Dental Equipment	0.20%	7.90%	35.00%	5.75%	5.80%	6.09%	36.52%	N/A	10.00%	0.78%	67.66%	N/A
11.	Area Equipment	N/A	N/A	37.00%	5.47%	4.60%	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
12.	Personal Equipment	N/A	6.50%	26.00%	34.76%	4.60%	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	15.00%	N/A
13.	Accommodation Equipment Includes Semi-Rigid and Rigid Structures	N/A	2.29%	38.00%	17.50%	6.70%	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	5.84%	0.00%	N/A
14.	Containers	N/A	N/A	34.00%	42.13%	4.60%	N/A	10.50%	0.00%	18.98%	-2.16%	12.00%	N/A
15.	Armaments	20.00%	8.00%	42.00%	N/A	4.60%	21.25%	40.50%	5.68%	26.86%	0.30%	6.00%	N/A
16.	Combat Vehicles	21.00%	8.70%	29.00%	5.47%	4.60%	N/A	24.50%	4.92%	19.37%	4.52%	84.00%	N/A
17.	Support Vehicles (Commercial Pattern)	N/A	5.00%	37.00%	9.44%	4.60%	15.44%	28.50%	N/A	34.47%	4.76%	79.00%	N/A
18.	Support Vehicles (Military Pattern, Includes: PLS)	21.00%	6.39%	34.00%	N/A	4.60%	N/A	36.53%	4.06%	70.41%	2.50%	16.00%	N/A
19.	Communication Vehicles	N/A	8.28%	29.00%	N/A	4.60%	N/A	N/A	N/A	15.17%	7.11%	0.00%	N/A
20.	Engineering Vehicles	N/A	3.10%	37.00%	5.74%	4.60%	13.43%	N/A	7.23%	N/A	10.75%	0.00%	N/A
21.	Material Handling Equipment	N/A	5.46%	24.00%	5.47%	4.60%	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	3.71%	0.00%	N/A
22.	Aircraft Support Equipment	N/A	N/A	31.00%	N/A	9.90%	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	0.00%	N/A
23.	Trailers	N/A	1.10%	25.00%	68.13%	4.60%	29.51%	19.50%	N/A	3.20%	3.94%	14.00%	N/A
24.	POL	N/A	20.00%	80.00%	N/A	10.00%	14.99%	36.00%	N/A	0.41%	4.48%	N/A	N/A

Statistical Model Calculations
(NO CUT)

SERIAL	GENERIC CATEGORY OF EQUIPMENT	MEMBER STATE AVERAGE	QTY DATA	FACTOR DATA	HANDICAP CATEGORY	SUM INPUT	AVERAGE (HANDICAP)	STANDARD DEVIATION	MAX VALUE	MIN VALUE	VARIANCE	WEIGHT UN COSTS	INCREASE UN COSTS
(a)	(b)	(c)	(d)		(e)	(f)	(g)	(h)	(i)	(j)	(k)	(l)	(m)
1.	Communication Equipment	11.09%	20.00	100.00%	0.86956522	2.21720000	9.64%	11.08%	37.02%	-0.06%	1.23%	0.100000%	0.009640%
2.	Satellite Equipment	9.71%	14.00	100.00%	0.60869565	1.35870000	5.91%	9.58%	28.00%	0.00%	0.92%	0.000000%	0.000000%
3.	Telephone Equipment	6.86%	17.00	100.00%	0.73913043	1.16680000	5.07%	13.85%	28.00%	-33.69%	1.92%	0.050000%	0.002537%
4.	Airfield Support Equipment	8.52%	13.00	100.00%	0.56521739	1.10720000	4.81%	10.64%	31.00%	-5.10%	1.13%	0.540000%	0.025995%
5.	Miscellaneous	2.02%	11.00	100.00%	0.47826087	0.22210000	0.97%	14.80%	29.00%	-30.00%	2.19%	0.180000%	0.001738%
6.	Generators (Stationary & Mobile)	8.06%	21.00	100.00%	0.91304348	1.69230000	7.36%	13.72%	37.50%	-31.27%	1.88%	1.550000%	0.114046%
7.	Engineering	8.14%	17.00	100.00%	0.73913043	1.38300000	6.01%	10.84%	37.00%	0.00%	1.18%	2.800000%	0.168365%
8.	Logistic Equipment	9.09%	15.00	100.00%	0.65217391	1.36320000	5.93%	10.32%	30.00%	0.00%	1.07%	0.220000%	0.013039%
9.	Demining Equipment	9.38%	11.00	100.00%	0.47826087	1.03130000	4.48%	13.51%	37.00%	0.00%	1.82%	1.000000%	0.044839%
10.	Medical and Dental Equipment	11.22%	19.00	100.00%	0.82608696	2.13170000	9.27%	17.03%	67.66%	0.20%	2.90%	4.360000%	0.404096%
11.	Area Equipment	8.38%	11.00	100.00%	0.47826087	0.92220000	4.01%	12.76%	37.00%	-2.20%	1.63%	0.200000%	0.008019%
12.	Personal Equipment	5.71%	16.00	100.00%	0.69565217	0.91300000	3.97%	15.94%	34.76%	-25.20%	2.54%	0.040000%	0.001588%
13.	Accommodation Equipment	3.61%	17.00	100.00%	0.73913043	0.61370000	2.67%	17.95%	38.00%	-54.92%	3.22%	0.030000%	0.000800%
14.	Containers	10.62%	16.00	100.00%	0.69565217	1.69950000	7.39%	13.55%	42.13%	-2.16%	1.84%	0.750000%	0.055418%
15.	Armaments	11.15%	23.00	100.00%	1.00000000	2.56340000	11.15%	12.99%	42.00%	0.00%	1.69%	0.880000%	0.098078%
16.	Combat Vehicles	11.91%	21.00	100.00%	0.91304348	2.50190000	10.88%	20.33%	84.00%	-18.55%	4.13%	33.540000%	3.648423%
17.	Support Vehicles (Commercial Pattern)	11.75%	20.00	100.00%	0.86956522	2.34910000	10.21%	20.92%	79.00%	-21.30%	4.38%	4.300000%	0.439180%
18.	Support Vehicles (Military Pattern; Includes: PLS)	13.74%	22.00	100.00%	0.95652174	3.02220000	13.14%	17.32%	70.41%	-6.41%	3.00%	41.330000%	5.430762%
19.	Communication Vehicles	8.04%	13.00	100.00%	0.56521739	1.04480000	4.54%	8.87%	29.00%	0.00%	0.79%	0.060000%	0.002726%
20.	Engineering Vehicles	8.40%	19.00	100.00%	0.82608696	1.59580000	6.94%	10.93%	37.00%	-4.00%	1.19%	5.210000%	0.361483%
21.	Material Handling Equipment	4.49%	16.00	100.00%	0.69565217	0.71770000	3.12%	14.35%	30.00%	-35.70%	2.06%	0.670000%	0.020907%
22.	Aircraft Support Equipment	7.42%	12.00	100.00%	0.52173913	0.89060000	3.87%	9.23%	31.00%	0.00%	0.85%	0.000000%	0.000000%
23.	Trailers	12.18%	21.00	100.00%	0.91304348	2.5576000	11.12%	16.45%	68.13%	-10.51%	2.71%	2.190000%	0.243528%
24.	POL		23.00	100.00%			6.63%					100.000000%	11.095208%

Statistical Model Calculations
(CUT 20)

SERIAL	GENERIC CATEGORY OF EQUIPMENT	ARGENTINA	AUSTRIA	BANGLADESH	BRAZIL	BURKINA FASO	CANADA	CHINA	DENMARK	FRANCE	INDIA	ITALY	JAPAN	JORDAN
(a)	(b)													
1.	Communication Equipment	N/A	N/A	30.00%	4.00%	7.00%	23.64%	2.00%	6.22%	2.00%	19.00%	7.17%	0.00%	7.52%
2.	Secific Equipment	N/A	1.61%	28.00%	2.00%	N/A	N/A	2.00%	6.22%	2.00%	22.00%	9.13%	N/A	0.00%
3.	Telephone Equipment	N/A	N/A	28.00%	2.00%	N/A	-33.69%	2.00%	6.22%	2.00%	20.00%	16.59%	0.00%	7.52%
4.	Airfield Support Equipment	N/A	N/A	5.00%	N/A	N/A	11.10%	2.00%	6.22%	2.00%	20.00%	4.02%	-9.10%	0.00%
5.	Miscellaneous	N/A	N/A	29.00%	N/A	N/A	17.80%	2.00%	6.22%	2.00%	N/A	2.91%	-9.70%	0.00%
6.	Generators (Stationary & Mobile)	N/A	0.41%	25.00%	0.00%	7.00%	-31.27%	2.00%	6.22%	2.00%	19.00%	11.15%	N/A	4.12%
7.	Engineering	N/A	1.61%	26.00%	5.00%	N/A	0.00%	2.00%	6.22%	2.00%	19.00%	2.29%	1.10%	2.35%
8.	Logistic Equipment	N/A	1.61%	30.00%	5.00%	N/A	17.23%	2.00%	6.22%	2.00%	19.00%	2.16%	N/A	0.00%
9.	Demining Equipment	N/A	N/A	30.00%	0.00%	N/A	N/A	2.00%	6.22%	2.00%	N/A	0.00%	N/A	0.00%
10.	Medical and Dental Equipment	N/A	N/A	5.00%	2.00%	10.00%	N/A	2.00%	6.22%	2.00%	N/A	3.44%	3.10%	3.69%
11.	Area Equipment	N/A	N/A	30.00%	5.00%	N/A	N/A	2.00%	6.22%	2.00%	N/A	2.13%	-2.20%	0.00%
12.	Personal Equipment	N/A	3.58%	30.00%	2.50%	2.00%	-23.16%	2.00%	6.22%	2.00%	N/A	4.50%	-25.20%	0.00%
13.	Accommodation Equipment	N/A	1.61%	5.00%	0.00%	N/A	-54.92%	2.00%	6.22%	2.00%	20.00%	2.13%	7.00%	0.00%
14.	Containers	N/A	N/A	30.00%	3.00%	N/A	-1.02%	2.00%	6.22%	2.00%	N/A	3.65%	N/A	4.25%
15.	Armaments	7.14%	3.58%	30.00%	3.00%	1.00%	0.00%	2.00%	6.22%	2.00%	20.00%	2.01%	0.60%	3.00%
16.	Combat Vehicles	N/A	1.61%	30.00%	3.00%	N/A		2.00%	6.22%	2.00%	16.00%	2.47%		9.56%
17.	Support Vehicles (Commercial Pattern)	N/A	-6.41%	N/A	3.50%	7.80%	-3.53%	2.00%	6.22%	2.00%	20.00%	0.24%		6.18%
18.	Support Vehicles (Military Pattern; Includes PLS)	22.00%	-6.41%	30.00%	3.50%	6.25%	4.32%	2.00%	6.22%	2.00%	18.00%	16.67%	-5.00%	7.18%
19.	Communication Vehicles	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	6.20%	N/A	2.00%	6.22%	2.00%	22.00%	1.90%	N/A	0.00%
20.	Engineering Vehicles	N/A	-4.00%	30.00%	4.00%	N/A	-1.16%	2.00%	6.22%	2.00%	24.00%	11.76%	-0.90%	3.81%
21.	Material Handling Equipment	N/A	N/A	30.00%	3.00%	N/A	-8.09%	2.00%	6.22%	2.00%	20.00%	5.30%	-35.70%	3.80%
22.	Aircraft Support Equipment	N/A	1.61%	5.00%	N/A	N/A	6.12%	2.00%	6.22%	2.00%	20.00%	5.21%	N/A	0.00%
23.	Trailers	13.51%	-10.51%	30.00%	2.50%	N/A	9.39%	2.00%	6.22%	2.00%	19.00%	2.22%	7.20%	4.25%
24.	POL	3.30%	N/A	N/A	0.00%	N/A	-27.33%	2.00%	6.22%	2.00%	N/A	1.61%	N/A	5.22%

Statistical Model Calculations
(CUT 20)

SERIAL	GENERIC CATEGORY OF EQUIPMENT	PAKISTAN	POLAND	RUSSIA	SLOVAKIA	SWEDEN	THAILAND	TUNISIA	TURKEY	UKRAINE	URUGUAY	ZAMBIA	ZIMBABWE
(a)	(b)												
1.	Communication Equipment	21.00%	N/A	27.00%	5.47%	4.60%	8.84%	N/A	-0.86%	37.02%	N/A	9.00%	0.30%
2.	Satellite Equipment	N/A	N/A	27.00%	N/A	10.00%	N/A	N/A	3.29%	N/A	13.62%	9.00%	N/A
3.	Telephone Equipment	N/A	8.00%	27.00%	N/A	4.60%	8.60%	N/A	-4.48%	13.32%	N/A	9.00%	N/A
4.	Airfield Support Equipment	N/A	N/A	31.00%	N/A	9.90%	N/A	N/A	24.58%	N/A	N/A	0.00%	N/A
5.	Miscellaneous	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	4.60%	N/A	N/A	-2.62%	N/A	N/A	-30.00%	N/A
6.	Generators (Stationary & Mobile)	N/A	0.00%	28.00%	11.16%	4.60%	7.23%	37.50%	10.91%	20.32%	1.88%	2.00%	N/A
7.	Engineering	21.00%	0.90%	37.00%	N/A	4.60%	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	7.15%	0.00%	N/A
8.	Logistic Equipment	N/A	N/A	29.00%	N/A	4.60%	N/A	N/A	N/A	15.00%	2.50%	0.00%	N/A
9.	Demining Equipment	N/A	N/A	37.00%	21.31%	4.60%	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	0.00%	N/A
10.	Medical and Dental Equipment	0.28%	7.90%	35.00%	5.75%	5.80%	6.09%	36.52%	N/A	10.00%	0.78%	67.66%	N/A
11.	Area Equipment	N/A	N/A	37.00%	5.47%	4.60%	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
12.	Personal Equipment	N/A	6.50%	26.00%	34.76%	4.60%	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	15.00%	N/A
13.	Accommodation Equipment	N/A	2.29%	38.00%	17.50%	6.78%	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	5.84%	0.00%	N/A
14.	Containers	N/A	N/A	34.00%	42.13%	4.60%	N/A	10.50%	0.00%	18.98%	-2.16%	12.00%	N/A
15.	Armaments	20.00%	8.00%	42.00%	N/A	4.60%	21.25%	40.50%	5.68%	26.86%	0.30%	6.00%	N/A
16.	Combat Vehicles	21.00%	8.70%	29.00%	5.47%	4.60%	N/A	24.50%	4.92%	19.27%	4.52%		N/A
17.	Support Vehicles (Commercial Pattern)	N/A	5.00%		9.44%	4.60%	13.44%	28.50%	N/A		4.76%		N/A
18.	Support Vehicles (Military Pattern; Includes: PLS)	21.00%	6.39%	34.00%	N/A	4.60%	N/A	36.53%	4.06%	20.41%	2.50%	16.00%	N/A
19.	Communication Vehicles	N/A	8.28%	29.00%	N/A	4.60%	N/A	N/A	N/A	15.17%	7.11%	0.00%	N/A
20.	Engineering Vehicles	N/A	3.10%	37.00%	5.74%	4.60%	13.43%	N/A	7.23%	N/A	10.75%	0.00%	N/A
21.	Material Handling Equipment	N/A	5.46%	24.00%	5.47%	4.60%	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	3.71%	0.00%	N/A
22.	Aircraft Support Equipment	N/A	N/A	31.00%	N/A	9.90%	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	0.00%	N/A
23.	Trailers	N/A	1.18%	25.00%	68.13%	4.60%	29.51%	19.50%	N/A	2.20%	3.94%	14.00%	N/A
24.	POL	N/A	20.00%	60.00%	N/A	10.00%	14.99%	36.00%	N/A	0.41%	4.48%	N/A	N/A

Statistical Model Calculations
(CUT 20)

SERIAL	GENERIC CATEGORY OF EQUIPMENT	MEMBER STATE AVERAGE	QTY DATA	FACTOR DATA	HANDICAP CATEGORY	SUM INPUT	AVERAGE (HANDICAP)	STANDARD DEVIATION	MAX VALUE	MIN VALUE	VARIANCE	WEIGHT UN COSTS	INCREASE UN COSTS
(a)	(b)	(c)	(d)		(e)	(f)	(g)	(h)	(i)	(j)	(k)	(l)	(m)
1.	Communication Equipment	11.09%	20.00	100.00%	0.86956522	2.21720000	9.64%	11.08%	37.02%	-0.06%	1.23%	0.100000%	0.009640%
2.	Satellite Equipment	9.71%	14.00	100.00%	0.60869565	1.35870000	5.91%	9.58%	28.00%	0.00%	0.92%	0.000000%	0.000000%
3.	Telephone Equipment	6.86%	17.00	100.00%	0.73913043	1.16650000	5.07%	13.85%	28.00%	-33.69%	1.92%	0.050000%	0.002537%
4.	Airfield Support Equipment	8.52%	13.00	100.00%	0.56521739	1.10720000	4.81%	10.64%	31.00%	-5.10%	1.13%	0.540000%	0.025995%
5.	Miscellaneous	2.02%	11.00	100.00%	0.47826087	0.22210000	0.97%	14.86%	29.00%	-30.00%	2.19%	0.180000%	0.001738%
6.	Generators (Stationary & Mobile)	8.06%	21.00	100.00%	0.91304348	1.69230000	7.36%	13.72%	37.50%	-31.27%	1.88%	1.550000%	0.114046%
7.	Engineering	8.14%	17.00	100.00%	0.73913043	1.38300000	6.01%	10.84%	37.00%	0.00%	1.18%	2.800000%	0.168365%
8.	Logistic Equipment	9.00%	15.00	100.00%	0.65217391	1.36320000	5.93%	10.32%	30.00%	0.00%	1.07%	0.220000%	0.013039%
9.	Demining Equipment	9.38%	11.00	100.00%	0.47826087	1.03130000	4.48%	13.51%	37.00%	0.00%	1.82%	1.000000%	0.044839%
10.	Medical and Dental Equipment	11.22%	19.00	100.00%	0.82608696	2.13170000	9.27%	17.03%	67.66%	0.28%	2.90%	4.360700%	0.404096%
11.	Area Equipment	8.38%	11.00	100.00%	0.47826087	0.92220000	4.01%	12.76%	37.00%	-2.20%	1.63%	0.200000%	0.008019%
12.	Personal Equipment	5.71%	16.00	100.00%	0.69565217	0.91300000	3.97%	15.94%	34.76%	-25.20%	2.54%	0.040000%	0.001588%
13.	Accommodation Equipment	3.61%	17.00	100.00%	0.73913043	0.61370000	2.67%	17.95%	38.00%	-54.92%	3.22%	0.030000%	0.000800%
14.	Containers	10.62%	16.00	100.00%	0.69565217	1.69950000	7.39%	13.55%	42.13%	-2.16%	1.84%	0.750000%	0.055418%
15.	Armaments	11.15%	23.00	100.00%	1.00000000	2.56340000	11.15%	12.99%	42.00%	0.00%	1.69%	0.880000%	0.098078%
16.	Combat Vehicles	10.83%	18.00	85.71%	0.78260870	1.94940000	8.48%	9.79%	30.00%	1.61%	0.96%	33.540000%	2.842734%
17.	Support Vehicles (Commercial Pattern)	6.61%	16.00	80.00%	0.69565217	1.05740000	4.60%	8.65%	28.50%	-6.41%	0.75%	4.300000%	0.197688%
18.	Support Vehicles (Military Pattern; Includes: PLS)	13.74%	22.00	100.00%	0.95652174	3.02220000	13.14%	17.32%	70.41%	-6.41%	3.00%	41.330000%	5.430762%
19.	Communication Vehicles	8.04%	13.00	100.00%	0.56521739	1.04480000	4.54%	8.87%	29.00%	0.00%	0.79%	0.060000%	0.002726%
20.	Engineering Vehicles	8.40%	19.00	100.00%	0.82608696	1.59580000	6.94%	10.93%	37.00%	-4.00%	1.19%	5.210000%	0.361483%
21.	Material Handling Equipment	4.49%	16.00	100.00%	0.69565217	0.71770000	3.12%	14.35%	30.00%	-35.70%	2.06%	0.670000%	0.020907%
22.	Aircraft Support Equipment	7.42%	12.00	100.00%	0.52173913	0.89060000	3.87%	9.23%	31.00%	0.00%	0.85%	0.000000%	0.000000%
23.	Trailers	12.18%	21.00	100.00%	0.91304348	2.55760000	11.12%	16.45%	68.13%	-10.51%	2.71%	2.190000%	0.243528%
24.	POL		23.00	100.00%			6.28%					100.000000%	10.048027%

Statistical Model Calculations
(CUT 15)

SERIAL	GENERIC CATEGORY OF EQUIPMENT	ARGENTINA	AUSTRIA	BANGLADESH	BRAZIL	BURKINA FASO	CANADA	CHINA	DENMARK	FRANCE	INDIA	ITALY	JAPAN	JORDAN
(a)	(b)													
1.	Communication Equipment Includes VHF/UHF - FM Transceivers and HF Equipment	N/A	N/A	30.00%	4.00%	7.00%	23.64%	2.00%	6.22%	2.00%	19.00%	7.17%	0.00%	7.52%
2.	Satellite Equipment	N/A	1.61%	28.00%	2.00%	N/A	N/A	2.00%	6.22%	2.00%	22.00%	9.13%	N/A	0.00%
3.	Telephone Equipment	N/A	N/A	28.00%	2.00%	N/A	-33.69%	2.00%	6.22%	2.00%	20.00%	16.59%	0.00%	7.52%
4.	Airfield Support Equipment	N/A	N/A	5.00%	N/A	N/A	11.10%	2.00%	6.22%	2.00%	20.00%	4.02%	-5.10%	0.00%
5.	Miscellaneous	N/A	N/A	29.00%	N/A	N/A	17.80%	2.00%	6.22%	2.00%	N/A	2.91%	-9.70%	0.00%
6.	Generators (Stationary & Mobile)	N/A	0.41%	25.00%	0.00%	7.00%	-31.27%	2.00%	6.22%	2.00%	19.00%	11.15%	N/A	4.12%
7.	Engineering	N/A	1.61%	26.00%	5.00%	N/A	0.08%	2.00%	6.22%	2.00%	19.00%	2.29%	1.10%	2.35%
8.	Logistic Equipment	N/A	1.61%	30.00%	5.00%	N/A	17.23%	2.00%	6.22%	2.00%	19.00%	2.16%	N/A	0.00%
9.	Demining Equipment	N/A	N/A	30.00%	0.00%	N/A	N/A	2.00%	6.22%	2.00%	N/A	0.00%	N/A	0.00%
10.	Medical and Dental Equipment	N/A	N/A	5.00%	2.00%	10.00%	N/A	2.00%	6.22%	2.00%	N/A	3.46%	3.10%	3.69%
11.	Area Equipment	N/A	N/A	30.00%	5.00%	N/A	N/A	2.00%	6.22%	2.00%	N/A	2.13%	-2.20%	0.00%
12.	Personal Equipment	N/A	3.58%		2.50%	2.00%		2.00%	6.22%	2.00%	N/A	4.50%		0.00%
13.	Accommodation Equipment Includes Semi-Rigid and Rigid Structures	N/A	1.61%	5.00%	0.00%	N/A		2.00%	6.22%	2.00%		2.13%	7.00%	0.00%
14.	Containers	N/A	N/A	30.00%	3.00%	N/A	-1.02%	2.00%	6.22%	2.00%	N/A	3.45%	N/A	4.25%
15.	Armaments	7.14%	3.58%	30.00%	3.00%	1.00%	0.00%	2.00%	6.22%	2.00%	20.00%	2.01%	0.60%	3.60%
16.	Combat Vehicles	N/A	1.61%	30.00%	3.00%	N/A		2.00%	6.22%	2.00%	16.00%	2.47%		9.56%
17.	Support Vehicles (Commercial Pattern)	N/A	-6.41%	N/A	3.50%	7.80%	-3.53%	2.00%	6.22%	2.00%	20.00%	0.24%		6.18%
18	Support Vehicles (Military Pattern; Includes: PLS)	22.00%			3.50%	6.25%	4.32%	2.00%	6.22%	2.00%	18.00%	16.67%		7.18%
19.	Communication Vehicles	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	6.20%	N/A	2.00%	6.22%	2.00%	22.00%	1.90%	N/A	0.00%
20.	Engineering Vehicles	N/A	-4.00%	30.00%	4.00%	N/A	-1.16%	2.00%	6.22%	2.00%	24.00%	11.76%	-0.90%	3.81%
21.	Material Handling Equipment	N/A	N/A	30.00%	3.00%	N/A	-8.09%	2.00%	6.22%	2.00%	20.00%	5.30%	-35.70%	3.80%
22.	Aircraft Support Equipment	N/A	1.61%	5.00%	N/A	N/A	6.12%	2.00%	6.22%	2.00%	20.00%	5.21%	N/A	0.00%
23.	Trailers	13.51%			2.50%	N/A	9.39%	2.00%	6.22%	2.00%	19.00%	2.22%	7.20%	4.25%
24.	POL	3.30%	N/A	N/A	0.00%	N/A	-27.33%	2.00%	6.22%	2.00%	N/A	1.61%	N/A	5.22%

Statistical Model Calculations
(CUT 15)

SERIAL	GENERIC CATEGORY OF EQUIPMENT	PAKISTAN	POLAND	RUSSIA	SLOVAKIA	SWEDEN	THAILAND	TUNISIA	TURKEY	UKRAINE	URUGUAY	ZAMBIA	ZIMBABWE
(a)	(b)												
1.	Communication Equipment Includes VHF/UHF - FM Transceivers and HF Equipment	21.00%	N/A	27.00%	5.47%	4.60%	8.84%	N/A	-0.06%	37.02%	N/A	9.00%	0.30%
2.	Satellite Equipment	N/A	N/A	27.00%	N/A	10.00%	N/A	N/A	3.29%	N/A	13.62%	9.00%	N/A
3.	Telephone Equipment	N/A	8.00%	27.00%	N/A	4.60%	8.60%	N/A	-4.48%	13.32%	N/A	9.00%	N/A
4.	Airfield Support Equipment	N/A	N/A	31.00%	N/A	9.90%	N/A	N/A	24.58%	N/A	N/A	0.00%	N/A
5.	Miscellaneous	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	4.60%	N/A	N/A	-2.62%	N/A	N/A	-30.00%	N/A
6.	Generators (Stationary & Mobile)	N/A	0.00%	28.00%	11.16%	4.60%	7.23%	37.50%	10.91%	20.32%	1.88%	2.00%	N/A
7.	Engineering	21.00%	0.90%	37.00%	N/A	4.60%	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	7.15%	0.00%	N/A
8.	Logistic Equipment	N/A	N/A	29.00%	N/A	4.60%	N/A	N/A	N/A	15.00%	2.50%	0.00%	N/A
9.	Per aining Equipment	N/A	N/A	37.00%	21.31%	4.60%	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	0.00%	N/A
10.	Medical and Dental Equipment	0.20%	7.90%		5.75%	5.80%	6.09%		N/A	10.00%	0.78%		N/A
11.	Area Equipment	N/A	N/A	37.00%	5.47%	4.60%	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
12.	Personal Equipment	N/A	6.50%			4.60%	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	15.00%	N/A
13.	Accommodation Equipment Includes Semi-Rigid and Rigid Structures	N/A	2.29%		17.50%	6.70%	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	5.84%	0.00%	N/A
14.	Containers	N/A	N/A	34.00%	42.13%	4.60%	N/A	10.50%	0.00%	18.98%	-2.16%	12.00%	N/A
15.	Armaments	20.00%	8.00%	42.00%	N/A	4.60%	21.25%	40.50%	5.68%	26.86%	0.30%	6.00%	N/A
16.	Combat Vehicles	21.00%	8.70%	29.00%	5.47%	4.60%	N/A	24.50%	4.92%	19.37%	4.52%		N/A
17.	Support Vehicles (Commercial Pattern)	N/A	5.00%		9.44%	4.60%	15.44%	28.50%	N/A		4.76%		N/A
18.	Support Vehicles (Military Pattern; Includes PLS)	21.00%	6.39%		N/A	4.60%	N/A		4.06%		2.50%	16.00%	N/A
19.	Communication Vehicles	N/A	8.28%	29.00%	N/A	4.60%	N/A	N/A	N/A	15.17%	7.11%	0.00%	N/A
20.	Engineering Vehicles	N/A	3.10%	37.00%	5.74%	4.60%	13.43%	N/A	7.23%	N/A	10.75%	0.00%	N/A
21.	Material Handling Equipment	N/A	5.46%	24.00%	5.47%	4.60%	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	3.71%	0.00%	N/A
22.	Aircraft Support Equipment	N/A	N/A	31.00%	N/A	9.90%	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	0.00%	N/A
23.	Trailers	N/A	1.10%	25.00%		4.60%		19.50%	N/A	2.20%	3.94%	14.00%	N/A
24.	POL	N/A	20.00%	80.00%	N/A	10.00%	14.99%	36.00%	N/A	0.41%	4.48%	N/A	N/A

Statistical Model Calculations
(CUT 15)

SERIAL	GENERIC CATEGORY OF EQUIPMENT	MEMBER STATE AVERAGE	QTY DATA	FACTOR DATA	HANDICAP CATEGORY	SUM INPUT	AVERAGE (HANDICAP)	STANDARD DEVIATION	MAX VALUE	MIN VALUE	VARIANCE	WEIGHT UN COSTS	INCREASE UN COSTS
(a)	(b)	(c)	(d)		(e)	(f)	(g)	(h)	(i)	(j)	(k)	(l)	(m)
1.	Communication Equipment	11.09%	20.00	100.00%	0.86956522	2.21720000	9.64%	11.08%	37.02%	-0.06%	1.23%	0.100000%	0.009640%
2.	Satellite Equipment	9.71%	14.00	100.00%	0.60869565	1.35870000	5.91%	9.58%	28.00%	0.00%	0.92%	0.000000%	0.000000%
3.	Telephone Equipment	6.86%	17.00	100.00%	0.73913043	1.16680000	5.07%	13.85%	28.00%	-33.69%	1.92%	0.050000%	0.002537%
4.	Airfield Support Equipment	8.52%	13.00	100.00%	0.56521739	1.10720000	4.81%	10.64%	31.00%	-5.10%	1.13%	0.540000%	0.025995%
5.	Miscellaneous	2.02%	11.00	100.00%	0.47826087	0.22210000	0.97%	14.80%	29.00%	-30.90%	2.19%	0.180000%	0.001738%
6.	Generators (Stationary & Mobile)	8.06%	21.00	100.00%	0.91304348	1.69230000	7.36%	13.72%	37.50%	-31.27%	1.88%	1.550000%	0.114046%
7.	Engineering	8.14%	17.00	100.00%	0.73913043	1.38300000	6.01%	10.84%	37.00%	0.00%	1.18%	2.800000%	0.168365%
8.	Logistic Equipment	9.09%	15.00	100.00%	0.65217391	1.36320000	5.93%	10.32%	30.00%	0.00%	1.07%	0.220000%	0.013039%
9.	Demining Equipment	9.38%	11.00	100.00%	0.47826087	1.03130000	4.48%	13.51%	37.00%	0.00%	1.82%	1.000000%	0.044839%
10.	Medical and Dental Equipment	4.62%	16.00	84.21%	0.69565217	0.73990000	3.22%	3.01%	10.00%	0.20%	0.09%	4.360000%	0.140259%
11.	Area Equipment	8.38%	11.00	100.00%	0.47826087	0.92220000	4.01%	12.76%	37.00%	-2.20%	1.63%	0.200000%	0.008019%
12.	Personal Equipment	4.45%	11.00	68.75%	0.47826087	0.48960000	2.13%	4.01%	15.00%	0.00%	0.16%	0.040000%	0.000850%
13.	Accommodation Equipment	4.16%	14.00	82.35%	0.60869565	0.58290000	2.53%	4.60%	17.50%	0.00%	0.21%	0.030000%	0.000760%
14.	Containers	10.62%	16.00	100.00%	0.69565217	1.69950000	7.39%	13.55%	42.13%	-2.16%	1.84%	0.750000%	0.055418%
15.	Armaments	11.15%	23.00	100.00%	1.00000000	2.56340000	11.15%	12.99%	42.00%	0.00%	1.69%	0.880000%	0.098078%
16.	Combat Vehicles	10.83%	18.00	85.71%	0.78260870	1.94940000	8.48%	9.79%	30.00%	1.61%	0.96%	33.540000%	2.842734%
17.	Support Vehicles (Commercial Pattern)	6.61%	16.00	80.00%	0.69565217	1.05740000	4.60%	8.65%	28.50%	-6.41%	0.75%	4.300000%	0.197688%
18.	Support Vehicles (Military Pattern, Includes PLS)	8.92%	16.00	72.73%	0.69565217	1.42690000	6.20%	7.13%	22.00%	2.00%	0.51%	41.330000%	2.564077%
19.	Communication Vehicles	8.04%	13.00	100.00%	0.56521739	1.04480000	4.54%	8.87%	29.00%	0.00%	0.79%	0.060000%	0.002726%
20.	Engineering Vehicles	8.40%	19.00	100.00%	0.82608696	1.59580000	6.94%	10.93%	37.00%	-4.00%	1.19%	5.210000%	0.361483%
21.	Material Handling Equipment	4.49%	16.00	100.00%	0.69565217	0.71770000	3.12%	14.35%	30.00%	-35.70%	2.06%	0.670000%	0.020907%
22.	Aircraft Support Equipment	7.42%	12.00	100.00%	0.52173913	0.89060000	3.87%	9.23%	31.00%	0.00%	0.85%	0.000000%	0.000000%
23.	Trailers	8.15%	17.00	80.95%	0.73913043	1.38630000	6.03%	7.39%	25.00%	1.10%	0.55%	2.190000%	0.132000%
24.	POL		23.00	100.00%			5.41%					100.000000%	6.805208%

Statistical Model Calculations
(CUT 10)

SERIAL	GENERIC CATEGORY OF EQUIPMENT	ARGENTINA	AUSTRIA	BANGLADESH	BRAZIL	BURKINA FASO	CANADA	CHINA	DENMARK	FRANCE	INDIA	ITALY	JAPAN	JORDAN
(a)	(b)													
1.	Communication Equipment Includes VHF/UHF - FM Transceivers and HF Equipment	N/A	N/A		4.00%	7.00%		2.00%	6.22%	2.00%	19.00%	7.17%	0.00%	7.52%
2.	Satellite Equipment	N/A	1.61%	28.00%	2.00%	N/A	N/A	2.00%	6.22%	2.00%	22.00%	9.13%	N/A	0.00%
3.	Telephone Equipment	N/A	N/A		2.00%	N/A		2.00%	6.22%	2.00%			0.00%	7.52%
4.	Airfield Support Equipment	N/A	N/A	5.00%	N/A	N/A	11.10%	2.00%	6.22%	2.00%		4.02%	-5.10%	0.00%
5.	Miscellaneous	N/A	N/A		N/A	N/A		2.00%	6.22%	2.00%	N/A	2.91%		0.00%
6.	Generators (Stationary & Mobile)	N/A	0.41%		0.00%	7.00%		2.00%	6.22%	2.00%		11.15%	N/A	4.12%
7.	Engineering	N/A	1.61%		5.00%	N/A	0.08%	2.00%	6.22%	2.00%		2.29%	1.10%	2.35%
8.	Logistic Equipment	N/A	1.61%		5.00%	N/A		2.00%	6.22%	2.00%		2.16%	N/A	0.00%
9.	Demining Equipment	N/A	N/A		0.00%	N/A	N/A	2.00%	6.22%	2.00%	N/A	0.00%	N/A	0.00%
10.	Medical and Dental Equipment	N/A	N/A	5.00%	2.00%	10.00%	N/A	2.00%	6.22%	2.00%	N/A	3.46%	3.10%	3.69%
11.	Area Equipment	N/A	N/A		5.00%	N/A	N/A	2.00%	6.22%	2.00%	N/A	2.13%	-2.20%	0.00%
12.	Personal Equipment	N/A	3.58%		2.50%	2.00%		2.00%	6.22%	2.00%	N/A	4.50%		0.00%
13.	Accommodation Equipment Includes Semi-Rigid and Rigid Structures	N/A	1.61%	5.00%	0.00%	N/A		2.00%	6.22%	2.00%		2.13%	7.00%	0.00%
14.	Containers	N/A	N/A		3.00%	N/A	-1.02%	2.00%	6.22%	2.00%	N/A	3.45%	N/A	4.25%
15.	Armaments	7.14%	3.58%		3.00%			2.00%	6.22%	2.00%	20.00%	2.01%		3.60%
16.	Combat Vehicles	N/A	1.61%	30.00%	3.00%	N/A		2.00%	6.22%	2.00%	16.00%	2.47%		9.56%
17.	Support Vehicles (Commercial Pattern)	N/A	-6.41%	N/A	3.50%	7.80%	-3.53%	2.00%	6.22%	2.00%	20.00%	0.24%		6.18%
18.	Support Vehicles (Military Pattern; Includes: PLS)	22.00%			3.50%	6.25%	4.32%	2.00%	6.22%	2.00%	18.00%	16.67%		7.18%
19.	Communication Vehicles	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	6.20%	N/A	2.00%	6.22%	2.00%	22.00%	1.90%	N/A	0.00%
20.	Engineering Vehicles	N/A			4.00%	N/A	-1.16%	2.00%	6.22%	2.00%		11.76%	-0.90%	3.81%
21.	Material Handling Equipment	N/A	N/A		3.00%	N/A		2.00%	6.22%	2.00%		5.30%		3.80%
22.	Aircraft Support Equipment	N/A	1.61%	5.00%	N/A	N/A	6.12%	2.00%	6.22%	2.00%	20.00%	5.21%	N/A	0.00%
23.	Trailers	13.51%			2.50%	N/A	9.39%	2.00%	6.22%	2.00%	19.00%	2.22%	7.20%	4.25%
24.	POL	3.30%	N/A	N/A	0.00%	N/A	-27.33%	2.00%	6.22%	2.00%	N/A	1.61%	N/A	5.22%

Statistical Model Calculations
(CUT 10)

SERIAL	GENERIC CATEGORY OF EQUIPMENT	PAKISTAN	POLAND	RUSSIA	SLOVAKIA	SWEDEN	THAILAND	TUNISIA	TURKEY	UKRAINE	URUGUAY	ZAMBIA	ZIMBABWE
(a)	(b)												
1.	Communication Equipment Includes: VHF/s, HF - FM Transceivers and IW Equipment		N/A		5.47%	4.60%	8.84%	N/A	-0.06%		N/A	9.00%	0.30%
2.	Satellite Equipment	N/A	N/A	27.00%	N/A	10.00%	N/A	N/A	3.29%	N/A	13.62%	9.00%	N/A
3.	Telephone Equipment	N/A	8.00%		N/A	4.60%	8.60%	N/A	-4.48%	13.32%	N/A	9.00%	N/A
4.	Airfield Support Equipment	N/A	N/A		N/A	9.90%	N/A	N/A		N/A	N/A	0.00%	N/A
5.	Miscellaneous	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	4.60%	N/A	N/A	-2.62%	N/A	N/A		N/A
6.	Generators (Stationary & Mobile)	N/A	0.00%		11.16%	4.60%	7.23%		10.91%		1.88%	2.00%	N/A
7.	Engineering		0.90%		N/A	4.60%	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	7.15%	0.00%	N/A
8.	Logistic Equipment	N/A	N/A		N/A	4.60%	N/A	N/A	N/A	15.00%	2.50%	0.00%	N/A
9.	Demining Equipment	N/A	N/A			4.60%	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	0.00%	N/A
10.	Medical and Dental Equipment	0.20%	7.90%		5.75%	5.80%	6.09%		N/A	10.00%	0.78%		N/A
11.	Area Equipment	N/A	N/A		5.47%	4.60%	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
12.	Personal Equipment	N/A	6.50%			4.60%	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	15.00%	N/A
13.	Accommodation Equipment Includes: Semi-Rigid and Rigid Structures	N/A	2.29%		17.50%	6.70%	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	5.84%	0.00%	N/A
14.	Containers	N/A	N/A			4.60%	N/A	10.50%	0.00%		-2.16%	12.00%	N/A
15.	Armaments	20.00%	8.00%		N/A	4.60%			5.68%			6.00%	N/A
16.	Combat Vehicles	21.00%	8.70%	29.00%	5.47%	4.60%	N/A	24.50%	4.92%	19.37%	4.52%		N/A
17.	Support Vehicles (Commercial Pattern)	N/A	5.00%		9.44%	4.60%	15.44%	28.50%	N/A		4.76%		N/A
18.	Support Vehicles (Military Pattern; Includes: PLS)	21.00%	6.39%		N/A	4.60%	N/A		4.06%		2.50%	16.00%	N/A
19.	Communication Vehicles	N/A	8.28%	29.00%	N/A	4.60%	N/A	N/A	N/A	15.17%	7.11%	0.00%	N/A
20.	Engineering Vehicles	N/A	3.10%		5.74%	4.60%	13.43%	N/A	7.23%	N/A	10.75%	0.00%	N/A
21.	Material Handling Equipment	N/A	5.46%		5.47%	4.60%	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	3.71%	0.00%	N/A
22.	Aircraft Support Equipment	N/A	N/A	31.00%	N/A	9.90%	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	0.00%	N/A
23.	Trailers	N/A	1.10%	25.00%		4.60%		19.50%	N/A	2.20%	3.94%	14.00%	N/A
24.	POL	N/A	20.00%	80.00%	N/A	10.00%	14.99%	36.00%	N/A	0.41%	4.48%	N/A	N/A

Statistical Model Calculations
(CUT 10)

SERIAL	GENERIC CATEGORY OF EQUIPMENT	MEMBER STATE AVERAGE	QTY DATA	FACTOR DATA	HANDICAP CATEGORY	SUM INPUT	AVERAGE HANDICAP	STANDARD DEVIATION	MAX VALUE	MIN VALUE	VARIANCE	WEIGHT UN COSTS	INCREASE UN COSTS
(a)	(b)	(c)	(d)		(e)	(f)	(g)	(h)	(i)	(j)	(k)	(l)	(m)
1.	Communication Equipment	5.54%	15.00	75.00%	0.83333333	0.83060000	4.61%	4.86%	19.00%	-0.06%	0.24%	0.100000%	0.004614%
2.	Satellite Equipment	9.71%	14.00	100.00%	0.77777778	1.35870000	7.55%	9.58%	28.00%	0.00%	0.92%	0.000000%	0.000000%
3.	Telephone Equipment	4.90%	12.00	76.59%	0.66666667	0.58780000	3.27%	4.83%	13.32%	-4.48%	0.23%	0.050000%	0.001633%
4.	Airfield Support Equipment	3.51%	10.00	76.92%	0.55555556	0.35140000	1.95%	4.85%	11.10%	-5.10%	0.24%	0.540000%	0.010542%
5.	Miscellaneous	2.16%	7.00	63.64%	0.38888889	0.15110000	0.84%	2.90%	6.22%	-2.62%	0.08%	0.180000%	0.001511%
6.	Generators (Stationary & Mobile)	4.71%	15.00	71.43%	0.83333333	0.70680000	3.93%	4.04%	11.16%	0.00%	0.16%	1.550000%	0.060863%
7.	Engineering	2.72%	13.00	76.47%	0.72222222	0.35300000	1.96%	2.30%	7.15%	0.00%	0.05%	2.800000%	0.054911%
8.	Logistic Equipment	3.74%	11.00	73.33%	0.61111111	0.41090000	2.28%	4.22%	15.00%	0.00%	0.18%	0.220000%	0.005022%
9.	Demining Equipment	1.85%	8.00	72.73%	0.44444444	0.14826000	0.82%	2.46%	6.22%	0.00%	0.06%	1.000000%	0.008233%
10.	Medical and Dental Equipment	4.62%	16.00	84.21%	0.88888889	0.73990000	4.11%	3.01%	10.00%	0.20%	0.09%	4.360000%	0.179220%
11.	Area Equipment	2.80%	9.00	81.82%	0.50000000	0.25220000	1.40%	2.77%	6.22%	-2.20%	0.08%	0.200000%	0.002802%
12.	Personal Equipment	4.45%	11.00	68.75%	0.61111111	0.48900000	2.72%	4.01%	15.00%	0.00%	0.16%	0.040000%	0.001087%
13.	Accommodation Equipment	4.16%	14.00	82.35%	0.77777778	0.58290000	3.24%	4.60%	17.50%	0.00%	0.21%	0.030000%	0.000972%
14.	Containers	3.74%	12.00	75.00%	0.66666667	0.44880000	2.49%	4.26%	12.00%	-2.16%	0.18%	0.750000%	0.018683%
15.	Armaments	6.70%	14.00	60.87%	0.77777778	0.93830000	5.21%	5.96%	20.00%	2.00%	0.35%	0.880000%	0.045872%
16.	Combat Vehicles	10.83%	18.00	85.71%	1.00000000	1.94940000	10.83%	9.79%	30.00%	1.61%	0.96%	33.540000%	3.632382%
17.	Support Vehicles (Commercial Pattern)	6.61%	16.00	80.00%	0.88888889	1.05740000	5.87%	8.65%	28.50%	-6.41%	0.75%	4.300000%	0.252601%
18.	Support Vehicles (Military Pattern, Includes PLS)	8.92%	16.00	72.73%	0.88888889	1.42690000	7.93%	7.13%	22.00%	2.00%	0.51%	41.310000%	3.276321%
19.	Communication Vehicles	8.04%	13.00	100.00%	0.72222222	1.04480000	5.80%	8.87%	29.00%	0.00%	0.79%	0.060000%	0.003483%
20.	Engineering Vehicles	4.84%	15.00	78.95%	0.83333333	0.72580000	4.03%	4.46%	13.43%	-1.16%	0.20%	5.210000%	0.210079%
21.	Material Handling Equipment	3.78%	11.00	68.75%	0.61111111	0.41560000	2.31%	1.89%	6.22%	0.00%	0.04%	0.670000%	0.015470%
22.	Aircraft Support Equipment	7.42%	12.00	100.00%	0.66666667	0.89060000	4.95%	9.23%	31.00%	0.00%	0.85%	0.000000%	0.000000%
23.	Trailers	8.15%	17.00	80.95%	0.94444444	1.38630000	7.70%	7.39%	25.00%	1.10%	0.55%	2.190000%	0.168657%
24.	POL		18.00	78.26%			4.17%					100.000000%	7.954968%

Statistical Model Calculations
(CUT 5)

SERIAL	GENERIC CATEGORY OF EQUIPMENT	ARGENTINA	AUSTRIA	BANGLADESH	BRAZIL	BURKINA FASO	CANADA	CHINA	DENMARK	FRANCE	INDIA	ITALY	JAPAN	JORDAN
(a)	(b)													
1.	Communication Equipment (includes VHF/UHF FM Transceivers and HF Equipment)	N/A	N/A		4.00%	7.00%		2.00%	6.22%	2.00%	19.00%	7.17%	0.00%	7.52%
2.	Satellite Equipment	N/A				N/A	N/A		6.22%			9.13%	N/A	
3.	Telephone Equipment	N/A	N/A		2.00%	N/A		2.00%	6.22%	2.00%			0.00%	7.52%
4.	Airfield Support Equipment	N/A	N/A	5.00%	N/A	N/A	11.10%	2.00%	6.22%	2.00%		4.02%	-5.10%	0.00%
5.	Miscellaneous	N/A	N/A		N/A	N/A		2.00%	6.22%	2.00%	N/A	2.91%		0.00%
6.	Generators (Stationary & Mobile)	N/A	0.41%		0.00%	7.00%		2.00%	6.22%	2.00%		11.15%	N/A	4.12%
7.	Engineering	N/A	1.61%		5.00%	N/A	0.08%	2.00%	6.22%	2.00%		2.29%	-1.10%	2.35%
8.	Logistic Equipment	N/A	1.61%		5.00%	N/A		2.00%	6.22%	2.00%		2.16%	N/A	0.00%
9.	Demining Equipment	N/A	N/A		0.00%	N/A	N/A	2.00%	6.22%	2.00%	N/A	0.00%	N/A	0.00%
10.	Medical and Dental Equipment	N/A	N/A	5.00%	2.00%	10.00%	N/A	2.00%	6.22%	2.00%	N/A	3.46%	3.10%	3.69%
11.	Area Equipment	N/A	N/A		5.00%	N/A	N/A	2.00%	6.22%	2.00%	N/A	2.13%	-2.20%	0.00%
12.	Personal Equipment	N/A	3.58%		2.50%	2.00%		2.00%	6.22%	2.00%	N/A	4.50%		0.00%
13.	Accommodation Equipment (includes Semi-Rigid and Rigid Structures)	N/A	1.61%	5.00%	0.00%	N/A		2.00%	6.22%	2.00%		2.13%	7.00%	0.00%
14.	Containers	N/A	N/A		3.00%	N/A	-1.02%	2.00%	6.22%	2.00%	N/A	3.45%	N/A	4.25%
15.	Armaments	7.14%	3.58%		3.00%			2.00%	6.22%	2.00%	20.00%	2.01%		3.60%
16.	Combat Vehicles	N/A	1.61%	30.00%	3.00%	N/A		2.00%	6.22%	2.00%	16.00%	2.47%		9.56%
17.	Support Vehicles (Commercial Pattern)	N/A	-6.41%	N/A	3.50%	7.60%	-3.53%	2.00%	6.22%	2.00%	20.00%	0.24%		6.18%
18.	Support Vehicles (Military Pattern: Includes PLS)	22.00%			3.50%	6.25%	4.32%	2.00%	6.22%	2.00%	18.00%	16.67%		7.18%
19.	Communication Vehicles	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	6.20%	N/A	2.00%	6.22%	2.00%	22.00%	1.90%	N/A	0.00%
20.	Engineering Vehicles	N/A			4.00%	N/A	-1.16%	2.00%	6.22%	2.00%		11.76%	-0.90%	3.81%
21.	Material Handling Equipment	N/A	N/A		3.00%	N/A		2.00%	6.22%	2.00%		5.30%		3.80%
22.	Aircraft Support Equipment	N/A	1.61%	5.00%	N/A	N/A	6.12%	2.00%	6.22%	2.00%	20.00%	5.21%	N/A	0.00%
23.	Trailers	13.51%			2.50%	N/A	9.39%	2.00%	6.22%	2.00%	19.00%	2.22%	7.20%	4.25%
24.	POL	3.30%	N/A	N/A	0.00%	N/A	-27.33%	2.00%	6.22%	2.00%	N/A	1.61%	N/A	5.22%

Statistical Model Calculations
(CUT 5)

SERIAL	GENERIC CATEGORY OF EQUIPMENT	PAKISTAN	POLAND	RUSSIA	SLOVAKIA	SWEDEN	THAILAND	TUNISIA	TURKEY	UKRAINE	URUGUAY	ZAMBIA	ZIMBABWE
(a)	(b)												
1.	Communication Equipment (Includes VHF/UHF, FM Transceivers and HF Equipment)		N/A		5.47%	4.60%	8.84%	N/A	-0.06%		N/A	9.00%	0.30%
2.	Satellite Equipment	N/A	N/A		N/A	10.00%	N/A	N/A	3.29%	N/A		9.00%	N/A
3.	Telephone Equipment	N/A	8.00%		N/A	4.60%	8.60%	N/A	-4.48%	13.32%	N/A	9.00%	N/A
4.	Airfield Support Equipment	N/A	N/A		N/A	9.90%	N/A	N/A		N/A	N/A	0.00%	N/A
5.	Miscellaneous	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	4.60%	N/A	N/A	-2.62%	N/A	N/A		N/A
6.	Generators (Stationary & Mobile)	N/A	0.00%		11.16%	4.60%	7.23%		10.91%		1.88%	2.00%	N/A
7.	Engineering		0.90%		N/A	4.60%	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	7.15%	0.00%	N/A
8.	Logistic Equipment	N/A	N/A		N/A	4.60%	N/A	N/A	N/A	15.00%	2.50%	0.00%	N/A
9.	Demining Equipment	N/A	N/A			4.60%	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	0.00%	N/A
10.	Medical and Dental Equipment	0.20%	7.90%		5.75%	5.80%	6.09%		N/A	10.00%	0.78%		N/A
11.	Aree Equipment	N/A	N/A		5.47%	4.60%	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
12.	Personal Equipment	N/A	6.50%			4.60%	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	15.00%	N/A
13.	Accommodation Equipment (Includes Semi-Rigid and Rigid Structures)	N/A	2.29%		17.50%	6.70%	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	5.84%	0.00%	N/A
14.	Containers	N/A	N/A			4.60%	N/A	10.50%	0.00%		-2.16%	12.00%	N/A
15.	Armaments	20.00%	8.00%		N/A	4.60%			5.68%			6.00%	N/A
16.	Combat Vehicles	21.00%	8.70%	29.00%	5.47%	4.60%	N/A	24.50%	4.92%	19.37%	4.52%		N/A
17.	Support Vehicles (Commercial Pattern)	N/A	5.00%		9.44%	4.60%	15.44%	28.50%	N/A		4.76%		N/A
18.	Support Vehicles (Military Pattern; Includes: PLS)	21.00%	6.39%		N/A	4.60%	N/A		4.06%		2.50%	16.00%	N/A
19.	Communication Vehicles	N/A	8.28%	29.00%	N/A	4.60%	N/A	N/A	N/A	15.17%	7.11%	0.00%	N/A
20.	Engineering Vehicles	N/A	3.10%		5.74%	4.60%	13.43%	N/A	7.23%	N/A	10.75%	0.00%	N/A
21.	Material Handling Equipment	N/A	5.46%		5.47%	4.60%	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	3.71%	0.00%	N/A
22.	Aircraft Support Equipment	N/A	N/A	31.00%	N/A	9.90%	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	0.00%	N/A
23.	Trailers	N/A	1.10%	25.00%		4.60%		19.50%	N/A	2.10%	3.94%	14.00%	N/A
24.	POL	N/A	20.00%	80.00%	N/A	10.00%	14.99%	36.00%	N/A	0.41%	4.48%	N/A	N/A

Statistical Model Calculations
(Cut 5)

SERIAL	GENERIC CATEGORY OF EQUIPMENT	MEMBER STATE AVERAGE	QTY DATA	FACTOR DATA	HANDICAP CATEGORY	SUM INPUT	AVERAGE (HANDICAP)	STANDARD DEVIATION	MAX VALUE	MIN VALUE	VARIANCE	WEIGHT UN COSTS	INCREASE UN COSTS
(a)	(b)	(c)	(d)		(e)	(f)	(g)	(h)	(i)	(j)	(k)	(l)	(m)
1.	Communication Equipment (Includes VHF/UHF - FM Transceivers and HF Equipment)	5.54%	15.00	75.00%	0.83333333	0.83060000	4.61%	4.86%	19.00%	-0.06%	0.24%	0.100000%	0.004614%
2.	Satellite Equipment	7.53%	5.00	35.71%	0.27777778	0.37640000	2.09%	2.76%	10.00%	3.29%	0.08%	0.000000%	0.000000%
3.	Telephone Equipment	4.90%	12.00	70.59%	0.66666667	0.58780000	3.27%	4.83%	13.32%	-4.48%	0.23%	0.050000%	0.001633%
4.	Airfield Support Equipment	3.51%	10.00	76.92%	0.55555556	0.35140000	1.95%	4.85%	11.10%	-5.10%	0.24%	0.540000%	0.010542%
5.	Miscellaneous	2.16%	7.00	63.64%	0.38888889	0.15110000	0.84%	2.90%	6.22%	-2.62%	0.08%	0.180000%	0.001511%
6.	Generators (Stationary & Mobile)	4.71%	15.00	71.43%	0.83333333	0.70680000	3.93%	4.04%	11.16%	0.00%	0.16%	1.550000%	0.060863%
7.	Engineering	2.72%	13.00	76.47%	0.72222222	0.35300000	1.96%	2.30%	7.15%	0.00%	0.05%	2.800000%	0.054911%
8.	Logistic Equipment	3.74%	11.00	73.33%	0.61111111	0.41090000	2.28%	4.22%	15.00%	0.00%	0.18%	0.220000%	0.005022%
9.	Demining Equipment	1.85%	8.00	72.73%	0.44444444	0.14820000	0.82%	2.40%	6.22%	0.00%	0.06%	1.000000%	0.008233%
10.	Medical and Dental Equipment	4.62%	16.00	84.21%	0.88888889	0.73990000	4.11%	3.01%	10.00%	0.20%	0.09%	4.360000%	0.179220%
11.	Area Equipment	2.80%	9.00	81.82%	0.50000000	0.25220000	1.40%	2.77%	6.22%	2.20%	0.08%	0.200000%	0.002802%
12.	Personal Equipment	4.45%	11.00	68.75%	0.61111111	0.48900000	2.72%	4.01%	15.00%	0.00%	0.16%	0.040000%	0.001087%
13.	Accommodation Equipment (Includes Semi-Rigid and Rigid Structures)	4.16%	14.00	82.35%	0.77777778	0.58290000	3.24%	4.60%	17.50%	0.00%	0.21%	0.030000%	0.000972%
14.	Containers	3.74%	12.00	75.00%	0.66666667	0.44840000	2.49%	4.26%	12.00%	-2.16%	0.18%	0.750000%	0.018683%
15.	Armaments	6.70%	14.00	60.87%	0.77777778	0.93830000	5.21%	5.96%	20.00%	2.00%	0.35%	0.880000%	0.045872%
16.	Combat Vehicles	10.83%	18.00	85.71%	1.00000000	1.94940000	10.83%	9.79%	30.00%	1.61%	0.96%	33.540000%	3.632382%
17.	Support Vehicles (Commercial Pattern)	6.61%	16.00	80.00%	0.88888889	1.05740000	5.87%	8.65%	28.50%	-6.41%	0.75%	4.300000%	0.252601%
18.	Support Vehicles (Military Pattern; Includes: PLS)	8.92%	16.00	72.73%	0.88888889	1.42690000	7.93%	7.13%	22.00%	2.00%	0.51%	41.330000%	3.276321%
19.	Communication Vehicles	8.04%	13.00	100.00%	0.72222222	1.04480000	5.80%	8.87%	29.00%	0.00%	0.79%	0.060000%	0.003483%
20.	Engineering Vehicles	4.84%	15.00	78.95%	0.83333333	0.72580000	4.03%	4.46%	13.43%	-1.16%	0.20%	5.210000%	0.210079%
21.	Material Handling Equipment	3.78%	11.00	68.75%	0.61111111	0.41560000	2.31%	1.89%	6.22%	0.00%	0.04%	0.670000%	0.015470%
22.	Aircraft Support Equipment	7.42%	12.00	100.00%	0.66666667	0.89060000	4.95%	9.23%	31.00%	0.00%	0.85%	0.000000%	0.000000%
23.	Trailers	8.15%	17.00	80.95%	0.94444444	1.38630000	7.70%	7.39%	25.00%	1.10%	0.55%	2.190000%	0.168667%
24.	POL		18.00	78.26%			3.93%					100.000000%	7.954968%

Annex I.A.2

Explanatory remarks on the statistical model

Background

1. Pursuant to General Assembly resolution 55/274, of 26 July 2001, on the reformed procedures for determining reimbursement to Member States for contingent-owned equipment, the 2004 Working Group on Contingent-Owned Equipment has carried out the triennial review of major equipment, to price level December 2002, based on data (group index per category) submitted by the Member States for the period from 1 January 2000 to 31 December 2002.

Discussion

2. The methodology developed by the post-Phase V Working Group to revise the reimbursement rates for major equipment is based on a model taking into account the very wide range of data provided by Member States.

3. The methodology, however, prevents extremely high or low indices from having an impact on the final result, by using a statistical model when computing the data.

4. The aim of the model is to reduce the variance among the indices, while keeping the majority of the provided data.

Description of the methodology

5. The computation of the data is done using both the provided data and variables derived from those data in one Excel spreadsheet. Formulas which produce the derived variables are part of the Excel spreadsheet. Any change to the provided data is automatically reflected in the derived variables.

Submission of national cost data

6. It is assumed that data have been provided in conformity with the methodology and the formats for periodic review of rates as contained in the report of the Phase V Working Group on Contingent-Owned Equipment (A/C.5/54/49).

The Excel spreadsheet

7. The Excel spreadsheet consists of two parts, namely:

   (a) The data area;

   (b) The calculation area.

The data area contains all data submitted by Member States. If a Member State did not provide data for a specific category, the cell is filled with "N/A". Zero ("0") is not used since 0.00 is a value.

8. The calculation area holds the following various factors and formulas:

   (a) "Member State average": the simple average of all data in the category;

   (b) "Qty data": the number of data in the category;

(c) "Factor data": shows the percentage of data used in the calculations. When you are cutting in the deviation of the data, the factor data figure must not drop below 50 per cent, otherwise it compromises the statistical validity of the model;

(d) "Handicap category": the number of data in the category, divided by the highest number of data in any category. This handicap factor makes it possible to compare the average of the categories, although the categories might have different numbers of data provided;

(e) "Sum input": the sum of all data in the category;

(f) "Average (handicap)": computed by a "handicap category", multiplied by "sum input" and then divided by "qty data". This average is weighed by the handicap category factor, and for that reason all categories can be compared, regardless of the quantity of data in it;

(g) "Standard deviation": the result of the calculation of all data in the category;

(h) "Max value" and "Min value": the highest and lowest data values in the category;

(i) "Variance": all data in the category are calculated by this formula;

(j) "Weight UN costs": shows the impact that each category has on the United Nations budget;

(k) "Increase UN costs": "average (handicap)" multiplied by "weight UN costs" gives the "increase UN costs" per category.

The cut

9. The model cannot indicate who has provided the data, it only deals with values. In annex I.A.1, pages 4 to 18 spreadsheets are shown for "no cut" "cut 20", "cut 10" and "cut 5".

(a) "No cut"

(i) The first calculation is a "no cut", using all data provided;

(ii) In order to obtain a more precise result, the statistic model must be allowed to delete factors out of range;

(iii) This is done by decreasing the "standard deviation" value;

(iv) In "no cut", all data are used in the calculations;

(b) "Cut 20"

(i) When cutting data away that is, to "cut 20", all categories with a "standard deviation" value higher than 20 will be recalculated;

(ii) The "average handicap" for each of these categories is then recalculated by adding and subtracting "20" from the value, giving a high limit and a low limit;

(iii) All data in the category is then checked and all data values outside the limits are deleted;

(iv) The "standard deviation" of the category is now lower than 20;

(v) When all relevant categories have been recalculated, the "factor data" shall be at least 50 per cent. Otherwise, the result before the cut is final;

(vi) If the "factor data" is higher than 50 per cent, there might be room for yet another cut;

(c) "Cut 10"

(i) In "cut 10", all categories with a "standard deviation" higher than 10 are recalculated;

(ii) The "average handicap" for each of the marked categories is then recalculated by adding and subtracting "10" from the value, giving a high limit and a low limit;

(iii) All data in the category is then checked and all values outside the limits are deleted;

(iv) The "standard deviation" of the category is now lower than 10;

(v) When all relevant categories have been recalculated, the "factor data" shall be at least 50 per cent. Otherwise the result before the cut is final;

(vi) If the "factor data" is higher than 50 per cent, there can be room for yet another cut.

The result

10. The impact on the United Nations budget is now shown in "increase UN costs" per category, and the bottom line shows the overall percentage.

Annex I.A.3

Views expressed by one group of Member States on the review of reimbursement rates of major equipment

Background

1. The existing methodology for the submission of data and the actual process of reviewing the reimbursement rates was established by mutual consensus in the Phase V Working Group in January 2000 and approved by the General Assembly. The methodology was based on the submission of cost indices based on the differences of rates at the beginning and at the end of the period under review. All the data made available to the 2004 Working Group on Contingent-Owned Equipment have been collected based on the guidelines of the Secretariat and in accordance with the accepted methodology.

The issue at hand

2. Having worked well within the parameters laid down as mentioned above, the Working Group worked very hard to review the available data and applied the established statistical analysis methodology to evolve a set of four representative values, which ranged in budgetary impact from 11.09 to 6.8 per cent. Having done the entire exercise, the only step left was to apply one of the representative values to the existing United Nations rates, so as to arrive at a recommended reviewed rate. A process of discussion then began to select the most appropriate rates. As a compromise, this group of Member States agreed to the lowest rate suggested by the approved model, which is 6.8 per cent. At that juncture, some Member States suggested that the reviewed rates should not be in accordance with those that had been decided by the approved model. They instead offered an arbitrary rate of increase of 0.5 per cent without any statistical justification.

Recommended course of action

3. In view of the foregoing, the following recommendations were made:

(a) The existing model is based on sound statistical logic and enjoys the consensus of the last Working Group and approval of the General Assembly. Any changes should only be allowed through established channels, that is, a recommendation made by the Working Group to the General Assembly, through the Fifth Committee;

(b) The paper submitted by Canada should be treated as a proposal only, to be considered by the next Working Group in 2007, together with other proposals submitted by other Member States;

(c) The process of either adopting or not adopting "any" data-based methodology should also be addressed. Based on the fact that some Member States are willing to ignore completely an established methodology, the question of considering a new methodology becomes irrelevant;

(d) For all practical purposes of this Working Group no departure should be allowed from the approved and adopted methodology;

(e) Any negotiations concerning the rates of reimbursement should be within the range established by the existing statistical model, as mentioned in paragraph 2 above.

Annex I.A.4

Views expressed by another group of Member States on the review of the reimbursement rates of major equipment

1. The Working Group was tasked with a triennial review of the reimbursement rates of major equipment with national cost data. In the view of many members, not all troop-contributing countries can expect full reimbursement for costs incurred in responding to the United Nations request for participation in peacekeeping operations. The contributions and sacrifices of those countries are especially valued when this is the case.

2. The Working Group had as reference calculations of the Secretariat and national cost data on which those calculations were based. In the view of many members, the results reported by the Secretariat did not accurately reflect the true change in member costs for major equipment. Notwithstanding the following, many members of the Working Group believe the statistical model should only be used as a decision support tool to assist in determining a revision to the rates of reimbursement.

3. Some members of this group cited misunderstandings as to on how various submissions, including null, zero, or blank data fields, were factored into the results. The concerned countries noted that the non-submission of data was a deliberate decision to indicate satisfaction with the status quo. The Secretariat advised that in most cases, these data were not factored into the final results. The concerned Member States felt that this indicated that the methodology was flawed.

4. Others noted that the values used by the Secretariat represented the percentage change in national costs and not the actual monetary value change, and thus did not reflect the actual change in costs when related to the existing United Nations reimbursement rate. In their view, this also indicated a flaw in the methodology, which rendered the results unsuitable for establishing a new reimbursement rate.

5. This group of Member States requested that these concerns, along with others identified elsewhere in the present report, be included in any reconsideration of the methodology for calculating rates.

6. In discussing the issue, which was the last unresolved task before the sub-working group major equipment, members of the Working Group wished to note they had already made significant concessions on other issues before the sub-working group, including the categorization of military and civilian patterned vehicles, threshold values for "special cases" of major equipment and explosive ordnance disposal and demining equipment.

Possible conclusions

7. The Working Group was unable to reach consensus on the review and is unable to recommend a change in rate from the status quo.

Annex I.B.1

Amalgamation of commercial and military pattern support vehicles

Aim

1. The aim of the present issue paper is to recommend a way forward, with consensus, on the subject of the amalgamation of reimbursement rates for commercial and military pattern support vehicles.

2. If amalgamation were to be approved, rather than defining the standard more clearly, the adoption of a common rate for each type of support vehicle, irrespective of the pattern, would assist the Secretariat in:

(a) Speeding up memorandum of understanding negotiations and limiting any requirement for renegotiation;

(b) Reducing the problems that can be encountered when verification takes place;

(c) Speeding up reimbursement;

(d) Releasing expensive United Nations resources for tasking on other important United Nations issues.

Background

3. The Secretariat highlighted a number of disadvantages of the current system, as follows:

(a) The memorandum of understanding between the United Nations and the troop-contributing country can take anywhere from between three months to a year to negotiate because of disputes over pattern types. After agreement within the memorandum of understanding, verification reports generated provide evidence that there is confusion in establishing which pattern type is actually in use. During the period from 1999 and 2002, the signature of 27 per cent of memorandum of understandings were delayed by this issue.

(b) The delay in agreeing on memorandum of understandings and the subsequent variation in verification reports causes an unnecessary burden in administration for the United Nations Secretariat and ultimately delays in reimbursement to the troop-contributing countries.

Issues

4. There were two main issues to be addressed and they revolve around the ability to differentiate between a commercial and a military pattern vehicle, namely:

(a) Where differing rates are to be maintained, the Working Group should concentrate on defining the standard within the 2002 Contingent-Owned Equipment Manual that is contained in paragraph 34 of annex A to chapter 3 (p. 3-A-7);

(b) If amalgamation should occur because no strict differentiation between the two types could be agreed upon, the method of amalgamation was to be discussed and agreed.

Discussion points and results

5. The Secretariat's position was clear but was at divergence with the opinion of some of the troop-contributing countries that believed that there was no problem with the current system.

6. The current definition within the 2002 Contingent-Owned Equipment Manual is contained in paragraph 34 of annex A to chapter 3 (p. 3-A-7). Although the Working Group agreed to tackle one issue at a time, information was provided to allow a decision to be based upon a choice between the two options: further definition, as opposed to amalgamation.

7. The Secretariat provided three documents, as requested by the focal point, to inform the process. They are contained in annex I.B.3 and concern the:

(a) Secretariat's position;

(b) View of the Surface Transport Section at United Nations Headquarters;

(c) Figures to assist in a decision to amalgamate the commercial and military pattern support vehicles.

8. A group, including the focal point and the focal point assistants, has provided a list of determining factors (see annex I.B.2) for deciding whether a commercial pattern vehicle should obtain military pattern rates.

Results

9. *Further definition (no amalgamation).* The list in annex I.B.2 provides the basis by which the Secretariat can determine whether a commercial vehicle has had enough modifications to it to allow the troop-contributing countries to receive the military pattern rate of reimbursement. Annex I.B.2 lists 10 items that are to be considered before reimbursement can be made; serial 1 is a mandatory requirement and, in addition to this, five other items on the list must be present on the modified commercial vehicle.

(a) *Advantage.* The Secretariat would have an easier system, reflected within the Contingent-Owned Equipment Manual, for determining the applicable reimbursement rate;

(b) *Disadvantage.* The system might be too simple to satisfy the requirements.

10. *Amalgamation.* The terms "commercial pattern" and "military pattern" would disappear and be replaced by the term "Support Vehicle". Where a vehicle type does not currently have an equivalent in the other category, the existing reimbursement rate in issue would remain. Where, however, there are both commercial pattern and a military pattern equivalents, the vehicle types would be amalgamated. The rate to be reimbursed would have to be negotiated; additional information received by the Secretariat indicates that, based upon current information, the military rate would only have to be reduced by approximately 3 per cent for cost neutrality.

(a) *Advantages.* The Secretariat's job would become much easier and it would achieve what they have proposed. Troop-contributing countries would have the flexibility to choose which type of vehicle to bring to a mission, unless specifically requested within the memorandum of understanding, and may allow for

the achievement of a higher capability. The contentious issue of reimbursement would largely be removed from the decision-making process;

(b) *Disadvantages*. This proposed method for amalgamating the support vehicles does not follow the methodology for all other vehicle types within the major equipment category. In addition, cost neutrality only happens with the data currently supplied. Different usage patterns would provide different outcomes.

11. Consideration should be given as to whether the current memorandum of understanding and verification processes are robust enough to cater for amalgamation when determining operational capability.

Recommendations

12. The concerns highlighted by some nations indicated that consensus was not going to be achieved on the amalgamation of the rates and, therefore, it is the recommendation of the Working Group that this option be set aside at this Working Group.

13. Within the Working Group consensus has been reached on the issue of "further definition". It is, therefore, the recommendation of the Working Group that annex I.B.2 be adopted, where there is a military pattern equivalent, and included in future versions of the Contingent-Owned Equipment Manual.

14. It is further recommended that the Secretariat begin an information-gathering process culminating in the presentation of the results at the 2007 Working Group on Continent-Owned Equipment. The information should provide evidence of how the new standard is being applied and should also provide analysis of how reimbursement would have been applied under the old standard. This information will assist the Working Group in assessing the impact of implementing the recommendation proposed.

15. The final recommendation is that Member States should be allowed to discuss and, where deemed necessary, implement any changes at the 2007 Working Group.

Conclusion

16. Much discussion has taken place on this issue and concessions have been made in order to achieve consensus. It must also be recognized that the Secretariat has endorsed the recommendation as workable.

Annex.I.B.2

Factors in deciding whether a commercial pattern support vehicle should be paid as a military pattern equivalent

Serial (a)	*Key sign* (b)	*List of changes* (c)	*Note* (d)
1	+	Fitted for military radio and antenna mounting, plus radio system (VHF/HF)	1 and 2
2	▲	Winch xx Kg with accessories	1 and 4
3	▲	X country mobility (4x4, 6x6, 8x8, etc.)	1
4	■	Auxiliary xx volt power outlet/adaptor	1 and 3
5	■	Additional xx volt power outlets (minimum 2 pieces)	1
6	■	Spotlight xx volts	1
7	■	Roof-mounted working lights (minimum 2 pieces)	1
8	•	Weapons stowage clamps and/or ammo box storage	1
9	•	Cargo tie down loops and cargo fastening equipment	1
10	•	Jerry can or equivalent mounts for extra fuel	1

Note

1. Serial 1 must be present always and then any 5 from the remaining list.
2. Magnet antenna holding accepted.
3. Dependent upon which voltage the vehicle uses.
4. Winch capable of pulling the weight of the vehicle it is fixed to and its normal combat load.

Key

+ Communication system — always

▲ Off-road capability

■ Electrical changes

• Cargo and storage

x Dependent upon operational requirements.

Annex I.B.3

Secretariat position on commercial and military pattern support vehicles

Memorandum of understanding negotiations at Headquarters

1. During memorandum of understanding negotiations, lengthy discussions regarding the pattern of support vehicles to be provided by troop-contributing countries or police-contributing countries frequently occur. Sometimes, the issue remains unresolved, delaying the signing of the memorandum of understanding and, consequently, not only is reimbursement not paid for the vehicles in question, but neither is it paid for all other equipment covered by the memorandum of understanding. The delay between deployment of a troop-contributing or police-contributing country contingent and the signing of the memorandum of understanding caused by non-resolution of the pattern issue during its negotiation phase has in the past lasted from 1 to 18 months. The major contributing factor to the problem of resolution of the pattern issue is considered to be the lack of clarity as to what constitutes a "significant" change or modification (Contingent-Owned Equipment Manual, chap. 3, annex A, p. 3-A-7 refers) to the commercial pattern vehicles converting them to military pattern vehicles.

Verification in the field

2. Following the deployment of a troop-contributing or police-contributing country, the United Nations conducts inspections which verify the pattern of the support vehicles that have actually been deployed. Where technical details of the vehicles are available from the troop or police-contributing countries prior to deployment, these are provided to missions to assist inspectors in the field. However, this is rare and for vehicles in dispute, where technical data from the troop or police-contributing countries has not yet been provided, these technical details are almost never available until well after deployment. In most cases, inspectors in the field during the verification process either interpret the Contingent-Owned Equipment Manual guidance in relation to "significant" changes, locally and declare the vehicles as commercial or military pattern in the verification report, or simply report what they see in the mission and refer the matter to Headquarters for resolution. Where the vehicle pattern has been declared by the inspectors in the field but the troop or police-contributing countries' contingent commander disputes the decision, the issue is normally referred for resolution to Headquarters. Resolution of the issue during the verification phase has over the period 1999-2003 lasted from 3 to 18 months. Again, the major contributing factor to problems in the resolution of the pattern issue at mission level is considered to be the lack of clarity as to what constitutes a "significant" change or modification to the commercial pattern vehicles converting them to military pattern vehicles. The situation is often exacerbated in the field because neither party, generally, has access to the technical data needed to make an informed decision. The lack of clear guidance in the Manual as to what constitutes "significant" changes also hinders the training of new inspectors.

Memorandums of understanding which have been delayed by the patterns issue

3. Over the period 1999-2003, approximately 34 per cent of memorandums of understanding were delayed due to the vehicle pattern issue. The number of delayed memorandums of understanding, by field mission, are detailed below:

Mission	*No. of contingent units*	*Delay (in months)*
United Nations Mission in Ethiopia and Eritrea	4	3
United Nations Mission in Sierra Leone	6	12
	7	18
	14	14
Total	**31**	
Total No. of memorandums of understanding	184	
Delayed (percentage of total)	34%	

Proforma used by verification teams in the field

4. The Secretariat has not issued, and is not currently aware of, a proforma used in the field that assists in determining whether a vehicle should be classified as commercial or military pattern. However, a locally produced proforma that attempts to address the lack of clarity regarding "significant" changes made to a vehicle may exist in one or more field missions.

"Significant" changes

5. The Secretariat considers that the major contributing factor to difficulties experienced in resolving the patterns issue lies with the lack of clarity as to what constitutes "significant" changes in the Contingent-Owned Equipment Manual. While a more precise definition of what constitutes a "significant" modification will greatly assist, the Secretariat acknowledges that this may be difficult to achieve. For example, some troop-contributing countries might regard modifications to a Jeep 4 x 4 type commercial vehicle costing in total 10 per cent of the initial base price of the vehicle as "significant". Others may consider the percentage cost largely irrelevant and prefer a base figure, that is, a modification or series of modifications costing in excess of $1,000 should be considered significant. Others may consider that the basis of "significance" should lie in the scope and complexity of the actual technical modifications carried out, that is, the development and fitting of a turbo charger to a commercial vehicle engine, fitting of a higher capacity electrical system, provision of armour protection, inclusion of military specification communications equipment and so on, is significant, whereas the fitting of a "rifle rack" or a cupola hatch to the drivers cabin is not.

6. In the past, the Secretariat and troop or police-contributing countries have resolved the issue by using a combination of the scope of technical modifications and cost, but the judgement nonetheless remained subjective in nature. For example, agreement was reached, at the Headquarters level, to reclassify jeep-type vehicles to military pattern, based on the following changes:

(a) Fitting of high frequency radio capability entailing "significant" structural modification to the interior of the vehicle, including extra electrical wiring and reinforced steel frames at an approximate cost of US$ 5,000 per vehicle;

(b) Fitting of an independent battery charging unit, including 2 x 24V batteries and a 24V alternator, with a 75 amp trip switch at an approximate cost of $2,000 per vehicle;

(c) Provision of a fixed satellite system at an approximate cost of $4,000 per vehicle (not to all vehicle variants);

(d) Stiffening of the suspension and upgrading of the shock absorbers at an approximate cost of $1,000 per vehicle;

(e) Fitting of military specification towing hitches and associated power connections for trailer lights at an approximate cost of $500 per vehicle.

7. In this particular case, the price of the basic vehicle variant was approximately $40,000 and the total cost of all the "military specification" modifications to most vehicle variants, not including tax and labour charges, was approximately $9,000; representing 22.5 per cent of the basic price.

Breakdown of vehicle usage and cost to the United Nations

8. The Secretariat is unable to provide "usage" figures for either commercial or military pattern vehicles, as such. However, the following data provides details of the numbers by pattern of support vehicles included in the memorandum of understanding of troop or police-contributing countries across all missions and the associated annual reimbursement costs.

	Commercial pattern	*Military pattern*	*Total*
Number of support vehicles	703	3 790	**4 493**
Annual cost in United States dollars	6 872 600	66 013 800	**72 886 400**

9. Given the fact that the military rate is broadly twice the commercial rate, if commercial pattern vehicles were classified as military pattern (less those vehicles for which there is currently no military pattern rate in the Contingent-Owned Equipment Manual), overall total costs to the United Nations might rise by an estimated $4 to 5 million (5.49-6.86 per cent).

10. In view of the anticipated difficulties in reaching consensus on further defining "significant" changes, the Secretariat proposed an amalgamation of the pattern types with a single reimbursement rate (to be decided by the Working Group). In addition to removing delays in the signing of memorandums of understanding (caused only by this issue), combining the categories would also relieve troop or police-contributing countries of the need to provide and justify supporting documentation, [relieve them of the requirement to provide] possibly sensitive information (communication fits, levels of protection added) and allow increased flexibility to them in the choice of vehicle to deploy, provided it met the operational requirement.

View of the Surface Transport Section of the Secretariat

11. The Surface Transport Section was requested by the 2004 Working Group on Contingent-Owned Equipment to provide advice on whether it was possible to define or identify clearly what constituted a military pattern vehicle versus a civilian pattern vehicle. This has been a problem faced by the Secretariat for some time in determining reimbursement rates for contingent-owned equipment.

12. It is clear that there are purpose-built military pattern vehicles, which are only for sale for military use and are very specific task-oriented, such as armoured personnel carriers or other armoured vehicles.

13. The difficult area is logistical support vehicles. The majority of logistic support vehicles are base vehicles available for sale to the general public for private or commercial use, albeit in some instances with some modifications.

14. To demonstrate the problem of subjectivity, the Surface Transport Section is comprised of a mixture of former military and civilian personnel and even between them there are different opinions on what determines whether a vehicle is military pattern or civilian pattern. For the purpose of comparison, listed below are some examples (it must be understood that these are opinions provided by various transport staff):

(a) If a truck is painted green and operated by the military, one could argue that it is a military truck. It could also be argued that it is a commercially produced truck being operated for military purposes. Jane's Military Vehicles and Logistics contains Volvo cargo trucks which are listed as military pattern vehicles. However, the Volvo truck is a commercially produced vehicle and readily available on the retail market;

(b) A civilian pattern vehicle fitted with a gun mount ring can be argued to be a military pattern vehicle. Or is it a civilian pattern vehicle modified for military use?;

(c) 4x4 Sport utility-type vehicles are used by most military personnel. The base vehicles, such as Land Rover, GMC, Toyota, Tata, etc., are commercially produced, but when operated by a military person, is it a military pattern vehicle?;

(d) Some military pattern vehicles are also for sale to the general public, such as the Land Rover Defender/110, HMMWV. Are these then civilian pattern vehicles?

15. The subject of modifications opens up a whole new area of discussions, as again there are many views and opinions as to what sort of modification makes the change from civilian pattern to military pattern. Some will state that it is the nature of the modification, while others will argue that it should be based on the cost of the modification.

16. Currently, there are no objective criteria available to the Surface Transport Section to allow a clear definition or identification of the essential differences between commercial and military pattern support vehicles.

Reimbursement as per current memorandums of understanding for support vehicles under commercial and military patterns

Category of equipment	Contingent-Owned Equipment Manual current generic fair market value (United States dollars)	Current monthly wet lease rate (United States dollars)	Current quantity as per MOU	Current total monthly reimbursement as per MOU[a] (United States dollars)
Support vehicles (commercial pattern)				
All-terrain vehicle	6 368	115	5	575
Ambulance - truck	50 942	867	9	7 803
Ambulance - armoured/rescue	159 195	1 644	1	1 644
Ambulance (4x4)	70 046	1 316	46	60 536
Automobile, sedan/stationwagon	10 613	300	1	300
Automobile (4x4)	14 858	544	122	66 368
Buses (12 PAX and less)	25 471	948	36	34 128
Buses (13-24 PAX)	37 146	1 146	23	26 358
Buses (greater than 24 PAX)	127 356	1 803	23	41 469
Snowmobile	6 368	98	0	0
Motorcycles	3 184	86	74	6 364
Truck, utility/cargo (under 1.5 ton)	18 042	553	209	115 577
Truck, utility/cargo (1.5 to 2.4 tons)	26 533	603	17	10 251
Truck, utility/cargo (2.5 to 5 tons)	42 452	784	42	32 928
Truck utility/cargo (6 to 10 tons)	74 291	1 203	14	16 842
Truck, utility/cargo (over 10 tons)	127 356	1 748	3	5 244
Truck, pallet loading	56 249	1 434	0	0
Truck, maintenance light	47 759	1 077	1	1 077
Truck, maintenance medium	79 598	1 033	3	3 099
Truck, maintenance heavy	233 486	2 033	0	0
Truck, water (under 10,000 litres)	84 904	1 285	0	0
Truck, water (10,000 litres and over)	84 904	1 285	13	16 705
Truck, crane (up to 10 tons)	135 846	824	1	824
Truck, crane heavy lift (up to 25 tons)	166 789	1 149	0	0
Truck, recovery (up to 5 tons)	133 724	1 772	0	0
Truck, refrigerator (20ft and over)	56 780	570	5	2 850
Truck, tanker (up to 10,000 litres)	95 517	2 335	14	32 690
Truck, tanker (over 10,000 litres)	153 589	2 740	6	16 440
Truck, tractor	95 517	1 733	34	58 922
Truck, tractor heavy (over 50 tons cap)	169 808	1 721	1	1 721
Total for support vehicles (commercial)			703	560 715
Estimated yearly reimbursement				6 728 580
Support vehicles (military pattern)				
Motorcycles	8 418	191	4	764
Ambulance	84 184	1 105	116	128 180
Jeep (4x4) with military radio	36 831	1 277	829	1 058 633
Truck, utility/cargo (jeep type) (under 1.5 ton)	31 569	1 081	681	701 321
Truck, utility/cargo (1.5 to 2.4 tons)	44 197	1 178	168	195 548
Truck, utility/cargo (2.5 to 5 tons)	70 504	1 529	1 401	2 142 129
Truck, utility/cargo (6 to 10 tons)	126 276	1 996	113	224 418
Truck, utility/cargo (over 10 tons)	159 950	1 949	30	58 470
Truck, maintenance light	78 923	1 741	27	47 007
Truck, maintenance medium	105 230	1 194	80	95 520
Truck, maintenance heavy	264 127	1 998	7	13 986
Truck, water (under 10,000 litres)	166 263	1 787	49	87 563
Truck, water (10,000 litres and over)	166 263	1 787	80	142 960
Truck, crane (up to 10 tons)	128 276	864	2	1 728
Truck, crane (10 to 24 tons)	210 460	1 337	3	4 011
Truck, crane (over 24 tons)	Special case		3	0
Truck, recovery (up to 5 tons)	138 904	2 202	50	110 100
Truck, recovery (greater than 5 tons)	368 305	3 740	28	104 720
Truck, refrigerator (under 20 feet)	105 230	799		0
Truck, refrigerator (20 feet and over)	105 230	799	14	11 186
Truck, tanker (up to 10,000 litres)	115 753	1 579	103	162 637
Truck, tanker (10,000 litres and over)	206 251	1 822	10	18 220
Truck, tractor (up to 40 tons tow)	117 858	2 093	7	14 651
Truck, tractor (41 to 60 tons tow)	144 165	1 525	7	10 675
Truck, tractor (over 60 tons tow)	Special case			
Total for support vehicles (military)			3 790	5 334 427
Estimated yearly reimbursement				64 013 124
				70 741 704

[a] The reimbursement rates in the Contingent-Owned Equipment Manual are exclusive of the Mission Factors (Environmental, Hostile Action/Forced Abandonment and Intensity of Operations) applicable to each Mission as well as the Incremental Transportation Factor based on distance between TCC and Mission area

100 per cent reimbursement of support vehicles as military pattern or military pattern equivalent

Category of equipment	Monthly Contingent-Owned Equipment Manual current generic fair market value (United States dollars)	Current monthly wet lease rate (100%) (United States dollars)	Current quantity as per memorandum of understanding	Forecast reimbursement as per quantity in current memorandum of understanding (United States dollars)
Support vehicles				
All-terrain vehicle[b]	6 368	115	5	575
Ambulance - truck[b]	50 942	867	9	7 803
Ambulance - armoured/rescue[b]	159 195	1 644	1	1 644
Ambulance (4x4)[b]	70 046	1 316	46	60 536
Ambulance	84 184	1 105	116	128 180
Automobile, sedan/stationwagon[b]	10 613	300	1	300
Automobile (4x4)[b]	14 858	544	122	66 368
Buses (12 PAX and less)[b]	25 471	948	36	34 128
Buses (13-24 PAX)[b]	37 146	1 146	23	26 358
Buses (greater than 24 PAX)[b]	127 356	1 803	23	41 469
Snowmobile[b]	6 368	98	0	0
Motorcycles	8 418	191	78	14 898
Jeep (4x4) with military radio	36 831	1 277	829	1 058 633
Truck, utility/cargo (under 1.5 ton)	31 569	1 067	870	928 290
Truck, utility/cargo (1.5 to 2.4 tons)	44 197	1 178	183	215 574
Truck, utility/cargo (2.5 to 5 tons)	70 504	1 529	1 443	2 206 347
Truck, utility/cargo (6 to 10 tons)	126 276	1 986	127	252 222
Truck, utility/cargo (over 10 tons)	159 950	1 949	33	64 317
Truck, pallet loading[b]	56 249	1 434	0	0
Truck, maintenance light	78 923	1 741	28	48 748
Truck, maintenance medium	105 230	1 194	83	99 102
Truck, maintenance heavy	264 127	1 998	7	13 986
Truck, water (under 10,000 litres)	166 263	1 787	49	87 563
Truck, water (10,000 litres and over)	166 263	1 787	93	166 191
Truck, crane (up to 10 tons)	126 276	864	3	2 592
Truck, crane (10 to 24 tons)	210 460	1 337	3	4 011
Truck, crane (over 24 tons)	Special case	Special case	3	
Truck, recovery (up to 5 tons)	138 904	2 202	50	110 100
Truck, recovery (greater than 5 tons)	368 305	3 740	28	104 720
Truck, refrigerator (under 20 feet)	105 230	799	0	0
Truck, refrigerator (20 feet and over)	105 230	799	19	15 181
Truck, tanker (up to 10,000 litres)	115 753	1 579	117	184 743
Truck, tanker (10,000 litres and over)	206 251	1 822	16	29 152
Truck, tractor (up to 40 tons tow)	117 858	2 093	41	85 813
Truck, tractor (41 to 60 tons tow)	144 165	1 525	8	12 200
Truck, tractor (over 60 tons tow)	Special case	Special case	0	
			4 493	6 071 744

72 860 928

[b] For items that have no corresponding military pattern, the current Contingent-Owned Equipment Manual rate of reimbursement (no increase, no decrease) was used.

97 per cent reimbursement of support vehicles as military pattern or military pattern equivalent

Category of equipment	Contingent-Owned Equipment Manual current generic fair market value	Proposed monthly wet lease rate (97%)	Current quantity as per memorandum of understanding	Forecast reimbursement as per quantity in current memorandum of understanding
	(United States dollars)	(United States dollars)		
Support vehicles				
All-terrain vehicle[b]	6 368	115	5	575
Ambulance - truck[b]	50 942	867	9	7 803
Ambulance - armoured/rescue[b]	159 195	1 644	1	1 644
Ambulance (4x4)[b]	70 046	1 316	46	60 536
Ambulance	84 184	1 072	116	124 335
Automobile, sedan/stationwagon[b]	10 613	300	1	300
Automobile (4x4)[b]	14 858	544	122	66 368
Buses (12 PAX and less)[b]	25 471	948	36	34 128
Buses (13-24 PAX)[b]	37 146	1 146	23	26 358
Buses (greater than 24 PAX)[b]	127 356	1 803	23	41 469
Snowmobile[b]	6 368	98	0	0
Motorcycles	8 418	185	78	14 451
Jeep (4x4) with military radio	36 831	1 239	829	1 026 874
Truck, utility/cargo (under 1.5 ton)	31 569	1 035	870	900 441
Truck, utility/cargo (1.5 to 2.4 tons)	44 197	1 143	183	209 107
Truck, utility/cargo (2.5 to 5 tons)	70 504	1 483	1 443	2 140 157
Truck, utility/cargo (6 to 10 tons)	126 276	1 926	127	244 655
Truck, utility/cargo (over 10 tons)	159 950	1 891	33	62 387
Truck, pallet loading[b]	56 249	1 391	0	0
Truck, maintenance light	78 923	1 689	28	47 286
Truck, maintenance medium	105 230	1 158	83	96 129
Truck, maintenance heavy	264 127	1 938	7	13 566
Truck, water (under 10,000 litres)	166 263	1 733	49	84 936
Truck, water (10,000 litres and over)	166 263	1 733	93	161 205
Truck, crane (up to 10 tons)	126 276	838	3	2 514
Truck, crane (10 to 24 tons)	210 460	1 297	3	3 891
Truck, crane (over 24 tons)	Special case	Special case	3	
Truck, recovery (up to 5 tons)	138 904	2 136	50	106 797
Truck, recovery (greater than 5 tons)	368 305	3 628	28	101 578
Truck, refrigerator (under 20 feet)	105 230	775	0	0
Truck, refrigerator (20 feet and over)	105 230	775	19	14 726
Truck, tanker (up to 10,000 litres)	115 753	1 532	117	179 201
Truck, tanker (10,000 litres and over)	206 251	1 767	16	28 277
Truck, tractor (up to 40 tons tow)	117 858	2 030	41	83 239
Truck, tractor (41 to 60 tons tow)	144 165	1 479	8	11 834
Truck, tractor (over 60 tons tow)	Special case	Special case	0	
Estimated monthly reimbursement			4 493	5 896 767
Estimated annual reimbursement for support vehicles				70 761 205

[b] For items that have no corresponding military pattern, the current Contingent-Owned Equipment Manual rate of reimbursement (i.e. no increase, no decrease) was used.

Annex I.C.1

Special cases of major equipment

Background

1. In the past, the United Nations encountered many problems relating to "special cases" of major equipment. A "special case" reimbursement rate for major equipment arises when a peacekeeping operation requires an item of major equipment that is either not listed as a category in the Contingent-Owned Equipment Manual or is an item considered by the troop contributor to be significantly more than the standard equipment. The Secretariat is of the opinion that the current special cases list is extensive and thereby contributing partly to the delay in the signing of the memorandum of understanding with troop-contributing countries. In order to simplify the problem the Secretariat therefore proposed that the approved "special cases" list of major equipment from 1 July 1996 to 28 February 2003 be reviewed by the 2004 Working Group on Contingent-Owned Equipment with the aim of reducing the list.

2. Furthermore, the Secretariat pointed out that minor equipment is categorized into two groups: items designed to support major equipment and those that directly or indirectly support personnel. For personnel-related minor equipment, rates of reimbursement for self-sustainment do apply. The Secretariat therefore proposed that a threshold value to be assigned to major equipment (i.e. US$ 1,000). By this approach, items under the threshold will then be considered as minor equipment if such equipment could not be combined into sets (i.e. riot control gear).

3. The focal point was tasked to examine the data in annex D to determine whether the special case should be considered major equipment, and recommend a generic standard reimbursement rate for each approved "special case" major equipment.

Findings

4. The focal point established the following:

(a) A total of 236 line items were categorized as "approved special cases";

(b) There was insufficient data from Member States on certain items.

Recommendations

5. From the above-stated findings, the focal point recommends that:

(a) The list at annex I.C.3 be retained as "special case" items;

(b) The nine items listed on page 1 of annex I.C.2 be categorized as additional major equipment;

(c) The threshold of US$ 500 for major equipment and its useful life must be greater than one year.

Conclusion

6. It is proposed that, during the next session of the Working Group, the current list of special cases be reviewed when sufficient data is available.

Annex I.C.2

Reimbursement rate for new categories and subcategories of major equipment

ITEM	RECOMMENDED AMOUNTS							
	GFMV[a] PER ITEM (US$)	USE FUL LIFE	MAINTENANCE COST		NO-FAULT INCIDENT FACTOR		DRY LEASE RATE PER ITEM (monthly)	WET LEASE RATE PER ITEM (monthly)
			PER ITEM	%	%	RATE		
ANTI-ARMOUR LAUNCHERS								
Anti-tank grenade launcher, (Light, 60-80 mm)	1 500	25	$10	0.67	0.50%	$0.63	$6	$16
Anti-armour grenade launcher, (Medium, 81-100 mm)	8 785	25	$8	0.09	0.50%	$3.66	$33	$41
ENGINEERING VEHICLES								
Truck crane 24 - 30 tons	300 000	18	$600	0.20	0.80%	$200.00	$1 589	$2 189
ENGINEERING EQUIPMENT								
Concrete mixer machine, below 1.5 m^3	1 800	8	$32	1.78	0.10%	$0.15	$19	$51
WATER STORAGE EQUIPMENT								
Water storage, 5000 - 7000 ltr	1 100	7	$11	1.00	0.10%	$0.09	$13	$24
Water storage, 7001 - 10,000 ltr	1 500	7	$15	1.00	0.10%	$0.13	$18	$33
Water storage, 10,001 - 12,000 ltr	1 680	7	$17	1.00	0.10%	$0.14	$20	$37
Water storage, 12,001 - 20,000 ltr	4 880	7	$49	1.00	0.10%	$0.41	$59	$107
Water storage, greater than 20,000 ltr	5 480	7	$55	1.00	0.10%	$0.46	$66	$120

[a] Generic fair market value.

ITEM	RECOMMENDED AMOUNTS							
	GFMV[a] PER ITEM (US$)	USE FUL LIFE	MAINTENANCE COST		NO-FAULT INCIDENT FACTOR		DRY LEASE RATE PER ITEM (monthly)	WET LEASE RATE PER ITEM (monthly)
			PER ITEM	%	%	RATE		
EOD AND DEMINING EQUIPMENT								
Metal Detectors	$3 000	5	$30	1	0.1		$75	105
Mine Detector (capable to measure shape or explosive content in addition to metal content)	$10 000	5	$100	1	0.1		$250	350
Bomb Locator	$7 000	5	$70	1	0.1		$175	245
EOD Suit – Light (minimum V50 rating of 1000 for the chest and groin)	$6 500	5	$65	1	0.1		$162	227
EOD Suit – Heavy (minimum V50 rating of 1600 for the chest and groin)	$10 000	5	$100	1	0.1		$250	$350
Demining Protective Helmet and Visor	$200	2	$17	8.5	0.1		$10	$27
Demining Protective Shoes	$500	2	$6	1.2	0.1		$25	$31
Demining Protective Vest/Jacket	$625	3	$6	1	0.1		$22	$28
Demining Protective Apron/Trousers	$625	3	$6	1	0.1		$22	$28
Reinforced Gloves (pair)	$150	2	$2	1.3	0.1		$7	$9
DEMINING PERSONAL PROTECTION SET								
Demining Protective Helmet and Visor	$200	2	$17	8.5	0.1		$10	$27
Demining Protective Shoes	$500	2	$6	1.2	0.1		$25	$31
Demining Protective Vest/Jacket or Demining Protective Apron/Trousers (alternatives)	$625	2	$0	0	0.1		$26	$26
Reinforced Gloves (pair)	$150	2	$2	1.3	0.1		$7	$9
Set Total	**$1 475**	**2**	**$25**	**1.19**	**0.1**		**$68**	**$93**

ITEM	RECOMMENDED AMOUNTS							
	GFMV[a] PER ITEM (US$)	USE FUL LIFE	MAINTENANCE COST		NO-FAULT INCIDENT FACTOR		DRY LEASE RATE PER ITEM (monthly)	WET LEASE RATE PER ITEM (monthly)
			PER ITEM	%	%	RATE		
RIOT CONTROL EQUIPMENT								
PERSONNEL EQUIPMENT (WITHOUT GAS MASK) - set of 10 - applicable to military contingents with riot control tasks only								
Elbow, knee and shoulder protection	4 500	2	$23	0.50	0.50%	$1.88	$189	$212
helmet with visor	3 000	2	$15	0.50	0.50%	$1.25	$126	$141
shield (plastic, transparent)	4 500	2	$23	0.50	0.50%	$1.88	$189	$212
baton	3 000	2	$15	0.50	0.50%	$1.25	$126	$141
without gas mask	0	2	$0	0.50	0.50%	$0.00	$0	$0
	$15 000		**$75**			**$6.25**	**$631**	**$706**
PERSONNEL EQUIPMENT (WITH GAS MASK) - set of 10 - applicable to military contingnts with riot control tasks only								
Elbow, knee and shoulder protection	4 500	2	$23	0.05	0.50%	$1.88	$189	$212
helmet with visor	3 000	2	$15	0.05	0.50%	$1.25	$126	$141
shield (plastic, transparent)	4 500	2	$23	0.05	0.50%	$1.88	$189	$212
baton	3 000	2	$15	0.05	0.50%	$1.25	$126	$141
with gas mask	10 000	2	$50	0.05	0.50%	$4.17	$421	$471
	$25 000		**$125**			**$10.42**	**$1 052**	**$1 177**
PLATOON EQUIPMENT								
Teargas launcher	4 600	5	$23.00	0.50	0.50%	$1.92	$78.58	$101.58
Loudspeakers	375	5	$7.50	2.00	0.50%	$0.16	$6.41	$13.91
Handheld searchlights	510	5	$2.55	0.50	0.50%	$0.21	$8.71	$11.26
Handheld metal detectors	600	5	$3.00	0.50	0.50%	$0.25	$10.25	$13.25
Signal pistol	540	5	$1.35	0.25	0.50%	$0.23	$9.23	$10.58
Taser (advanced pistol)	600	5	$3.00	0.50	0.50%	$0.25	$10.25	$13.25
	$7 225		**$40**			**$3.01**	**$123.43**	**$163.83**
COMPANY EQUIPMENT								
Searchlights and generators	3 466	10	$17	0.50	0.50%	$1.44	$30	$48
Automatic (TG) Grenade launcher	5 931	10	$30	0.50	0.50%	$2.47	$52	$82
Signal Pistols	540	10	$1	0.25	0.50%	$0.23	$5	$6
Tear gas launcher	4 600	10	$23	0.50	0.50%	$1.92	$40	$63
Loudspeakers	250	10	$5	2.00	0.50%	$0.10	$2	$7
Public address system (set)	1 200	10	$24	2.00	0.50%	$0.50	$11	$35
	$15 987		**$100**			**$6.66**	**$140**	**$240**

Annex I.C.3

Special cases to be retained as "special cases" under major equipment (as per 2004 Working Group on Contingent-Owned Equipment)

SERIAL	ITEMS	GFMV* PER ITEM (US$)	MAINTENANCE COST MONTHLY PER ITEM	MAINTENANCE COST MONTHLY %	USE FUL LIFE	UN APPROVED AMOUNTS GFMV PER ITEM (US$)	USE FUL LIFE	MAINTENANCE COST PER ITEM	MAINTENANCE COST %	NO-FAULT INCIDENT FACTOR %	NO-FAULT INCIDENT FACTOR RATE	DRY LEASE RATE PER ITEM (monthly)	WET LEASE RATE PER ITEM (monthly)
	Armament												
1	Gun M-46 (130 mm)	902 353	4 511	0 50	8	500 000	10	$500	0 10	0 50%	$208 33	$4 375	$4 875
2	Mortar fire control	350 000	700	0 20	10	150 000	10	$250	0 17	0 80%	$100 00	$1 350	$1 600
3	Gun tow (Mercedes 2028A)	284 700	2 847	1 00	16	120 000	15	$1 292	1 08	0 80%	$80 00	$747	$2 039
4	Grenade Launcher (M79) 40mm	493	1	0 21	30	493	30	$1	0 21	0 50%	$0 21	$2	$3
5	105mm Howitzer light, towed	177 000	250	0 14	not prov.	177 000	30	$250	0 14	0 10%	$14 75	$506	$756
6	122 mm Howitzer Artillery Gun, towed	701 252	3 506	0 50	25	TBD - under review							
7	105mm Howitzer (towed)	116 183	484	0 42	20	116 183	30	$484	0 42	0 10%	$9 68	$332	$816
8	Tactical Gas Howitzer	141	3	2 13	15	141	15	$3	2 13	0 50%	$0 06	$1	$4
	Anti armour missile(Launchers)												
9	Truck GAZ-66 anti-missile station 9V866	550 000	546	0 10	20	550 000	20	$546	0 10	0 50%	$229 17	$2 521	$3 067
10	Truck GAZ-66 anti-missile station 9V817	350 000	546	0 16	20	350 000	20	$546	0 16	0 50%	$145 83	$1 604	$2 150
11	Anti armour MILAN (firing post, launcher only)	27 298	250	0 92	25	27 298	25	$250	0 92	0 50%	$11 37	$102	$352
12	Anti tank weapon system TF-8	143 619	1 148	0 80	n/a	143 619	25	$1 148	0 80	0 50%	$59 84	$539	$1 687
13	Launching mechanism 9P516,9P (9m39)	16 000	24	0 15	10	16 000	10	$24	0 15	0 50%	$6 67	$140	$164
14	Launching mechanism 9P-A-TK (9P135m)	85 000	42	0 05	20	85 000	20	$42	0 05	0 50%	$35 42	$390	$432
15	Anti-tank grenade launcher 40 mm	10 050	12	0 12	87	10 050	12	$87	0 87	0 50%	$4 19	$74	$161
16	Anti-armour grenade launcher 40 mm	20 000	25	0 13	20	20 000	25	$20	0 10	0 50%	$8 33	$75	$95
17	Anti-armour missile Tow (Launcher only)	179 000	208	0 12	5	179 000	25	$208	0 12	0 50%	$74 58	$671	$879
18	Anti-armour missile Dragon (Launcher only)	45 000	25	0 06	7	45 000	25	$25	0 06	0 50%	$18 75	$169	$194
19	Katusha Rocket Launcher (Multi Barrel Rocket Launcher (12BL) 120m	25 000	189	0 76	15	25 000	15	$189	0 76	0 50%	$10 42	$149	$338
20	TOW Launcher (Anti-Armor Missile)	87 120	208	0 24	15	80 475	15	$208	0 26	0 50%	$33 53	$481	$689
21	Rocket Launcher B8V20 (Helicopter)	5 850	7	0 12	15	5 850	15	$7	0 12	0 10%	$0 49	$33	$40
	Support vehicles												
22	Tractor cargo	30 000	100	0 33	5	30 000	5	$100	0 33	0 80%	$20 00	$520	$620
23	Workshop Container on tow truck	57 000	137	0 24	9	57 000	9	$137	0 24	0 20%	$9 50	$537	$674
24	Flat bed truck (over 20 tons)	133 622	250	0 19	18	133 622	18	$250	0 19	0 80%	$89 08	$708	$958
25	Landing craft medium (LCM 8)	199 412	4 412	2 21	34	199 412	34	$4 412	2 21	0 50%	$83 09	$572	$4 984
26	Lighter Amphibious Resupply Cargo 5 tons	358 824	981	0 27	42	358 824	42	$981	0 27	0 50%	$149 51	$861	$1 842
27	Support Craft Rigid (Boat)	380 000	7 600	2 00	15	380 000	15	$7 600	2 00	0 50%	$158 33	$2 269	$9 869
28	Trichark Boat and Overboard Motor 55/25HP	4 581	100	2 18	10	4 581	10	$100	2 18	0 50%	$1 91	$40	$140
	Engineering Vehicles												
29	Truck 55 tons Rough Terrain Crane	564 516	565	0 10	12	450 000	15	$450	0 10	0 10%	$37 50	$2 538	$2 988
30	Compressor mounted truck	103 816	557	0 54	13	103 816	13	$557	0 54	0 10%	$8 65	$674	$1 231
31	Welding truck	44 623	664	1 49	11	44 623	11	$664	1 49	0 10%	$3 72	$342	$1 006
32	Craw er dump with crane	70 992	702	0 99	15	70 992	15	$702	0 99	0 10%	$5 92	$400	$1 102
33	Rubber crawler mounted jaw crusher	146 564	595	0 41	20	146 564	20	$595	0 41	0 10%	$12 21	$623	$1 218
34	PTS-M Special Vehicle	470 000	3 280	0 70	12	368 000	12	$2 576	0 70	0 50%	$153 33	$2 709	$5 285
35	BAT-M Road Layer	202 500	1 735	0 86	12	202 500	12	$1 742	0 86	0 50%	$84 38	$1 491	$3 233
36	Earth-moving machine PZM-2	362 052	300	0 08	18	260 000	18	$300	0 12	0 10%	$21 67	$1 225	$1 525
37	Bull dozer (D2)	67 938	542	0 80	14	67 938	14	$542	0 80	0 10%	$5 66	$410	$952

* Generic fair market value

SERIAL	ITEMS	GFMV* PER ITEM (US$)	MAINTENANCE COST MONTHLY PER ITEM	MAINTENANCE COST MONTHLY %	USE FUL LIFE	UN APPROVED AMOUNTS GFMV PER ITEM (US$)	USE FUL LIFE	MAINTENANCE COST PER ITEM	MAINTENANCE COST %	NO-FAULT INCIDENT FACTOR %	NO-FAULT INCIDENT FACTOR RATE	DRY LEASE RATE PER ITEM (monthly)	WET LEASE RATE PER ITEM (monthly)
	Engineering equipment												
38	WFS-1,5 Filter Station Set	170 400	1 545	0.91	10	170 400	10	$1 551	0.91	0.50%	$71.00	$1 491	$3 042
39	MRIV Main Station ZIL-131 Set	185 000	375	0.20	20	137 000	20	$274	0.20	0.50%	$57.08	$628	$902
40	Block making machine	4 500	75	1.67	5	4 500	5	$68	1.51	0.10%	$0.38	$75	$143
41	Concrete mixer (small)	46 564	69	0.15	20	46 564	20	$69	0.15	0.10%	$3.88	$198	$267
42	Geodetical set	12 500	10	0.08	8	12 500	20	$10	0.08	0.10%	$1.04	$53	$63
43	Nivelisation set	5 150	5	0.10	8	5 150	8	$5	0.10	0.10%	$0.43	$54	$59
44	Sawmill mobile GKT-80	50 000	200	0.40	8	50 000	15	$200	0.40	0.10%	$4.17	$282	$482
45	Rock drill (compressor driven)	5 112	301	5.89	5	5 112	5	$301	5.89	0.50%	$2.13	$87	$388
46	Bitumen heater	99 606	90	0.09	8	99 605	8	$90	0.09	0.50%	$41.50	$1 079	$1 169
47	UDV-15 Water Drilling	15 000	150	1.00	10	11 000	10	$110	1.00	0.50%	$4.58	$96	$206
	Military dogs												
48	Guard and drug dogs (see note 4)	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	$80	n/a
49	Mine clearing dogs	25 000	665	2.66	5	25 000	5	$665	2.66	0.10%	$2.08	$419	$1 084
50	Dog, search for explosive ammo & firearms	28 000	168	0.60	8	28 000	8	$168	0.60	0.10%	$2.33	$294	$462
51	Dog, search for drugs	27 000	162	0.60	6	27 000	6	$162	0.60	0.10%	$2.25	$377	$539
52	Dog, patrol service	25 000	150	0.60	8	25 000	8	$150	0.60	0.10%	$2.08	$263	$413
53	Dog demining team of 4 dogs	18 600	1 200	6.45	20	18 600	8	$1 200	6.45	0.10%	$1.55	$195	$1 395
	Water/Fuel Storage Equipment												
54	Fuel blivet , 500 gallons	2 281	10	8.77	7.5	2 281	10	$5	0.22	0.50%	$0.95	$20	$25
55	Water tank/bladder and pump (25 000 L)	2 150	10	0.47	5	2 150	5	$10	0.47	0.50%	$0.90	$37	$47
56	Water Bagger	102 958	714	0.69	20	102 958	20	$714	0.69	0.50%	$42.90	$472	$1 186
57	Fuel quality inspection lab	17 000	25	0.15	3	17 000	3	$25	0.15	0.10%	$1.42	$474	$499
58	Water Purification Set	76 297	250	0.33	12	76 297	12	$250	0.33	0.50%	$31.79	$562	$812
59	Reservoir - PB (Helicopter, fuel)	850	0	0.00	12	850	12	$0	0.00	0.10%	$0.07	$6	$6
60	Reverse Osmosis Water Purification Unit	480 472	3 798	0.79	20	480 472	20	$3 798	0.79	0.50%	$200.20	$2 202	$6 000
	Demining equipment												
61	Tanks mine clearing T-55C	850 500	5 288	0.62	20	850 000	25	$ 5 288	0.62	0.50%	$354.17	$3 188	$8 476
62	Armoured vehicle (mine protection vehicle) Nyala	220 000	2 000	0.91	10	220 000	15	$ 2 000	0.91	1.00%	$183.33	$1 406	$3 406
63	BMR Combat Mine Detector	625 000	3 430.00	0.55	12	403 600	12	$ 2 220	0.55	0.50%	$168.17	$2 971	$5 191
64	Remote controlled demining equipment Bozena	240 000	1 800	0.75	4	240 000	4	$ 1 800	0.75	0.80%	$160.00	$5 160	$6 960
65	Heavy demining flail equipment BELARTY	382 200	3 600	0.94	4	382 200	15	$ 3 600	0.94	0.10%	$31.85	$2 155	$5 755
66	Mine Clearing Vehicle RAISU	484 000	5 230.00	1.08	15	484 000	15	$ 5 230	1.08	0.10%	$40.33	$2 729	$7 959
67	Aardvark flail	384 015	2 631	0.69	10	384 015	10	$ 2 631	0.69	0.80%	$256.01	$3 456	$6 087
68	Mini Flail (Trailer mounted)	153 737	1 053	0.68	10	153 737	10	$ 1 053	0.68	0.80%	$102.49	$1 384	$2 437
69	Mine clearing system vehicle mounted TRAL	7 533	650	8.63	8	7 533	8	$ 650	8.63	0.80%	$5.02	$83	$733
70	Mine clearing system vehicle mounted KMT 7	20 000	1 200	6.00	8	20 000	8	$ 1 200	6.00	0.80%	$13.33	$222	$1 422
71	Mine clearing system-vehicle mounted	92 450	599.00	0.65	7	92 450	7	$ 599	0.65	0.10%	$7.70	$1 108	$1 707
72	Mine protection armoured vehicle	347 948	2 504	0.72	15	347 948	15	2 504	0.72	1.00%	$289.96	$2 223	$4 727
73	Mechanical Mine Clearance device	450 000	4 500	1.00	10	450 000	10	$ 4 500	1.00	0.80%	$300.00	$4 050	$8 550
74	Obstacle Clearing Vehicle BMR (combat mine clearing)	236 000	11 400	4.83	7.5	236 000	15	$ 3 600	1.61	0.10%	$19.67	$1 331	$5 131
75	Remote controlled robot	TBD											
76	DIM-M Road Mine Detector	38 000	275.00	0.72	6	28 000	6	$ 202	0.72	0.50%	$11.67	$401	$603
77	DIM-M Road Mine Detector	15 138	150.00	0.99	5	15 136	5	$ 150	0.99	0.10%	$1.26	$254	$404

SERIAL	ITEMS	GFMV* PER ITEM (US$)	MAINTENANCE COST MONTHLY PER ITEM	MAINTENANCE COST MONTHLY %	USE FUL LIFE	UN APPROVED AMOUNTS GFMV PER ITEM (US$)	USE FUL LIFE	MAINTENANCE COST PER ITEM	MAINTENANCE COST %	NO-FAULT INCIDENT FACTOR %	NO-FAULT INCIDENT FACTOR RATE	DRY LEASE RATE PER ITEM (monthly)	WET LEASE RATE PER ITEM (monthly)
	Demining Equipment (Continued)												
78	Bomb locator set	34 806	515	1.48	8	21 170	8	$224	1.06	0.10%	$1.76	$237	$461
79	Demolition Kit	1 000	10.00	1.00	10	1 000	10	$ 10	1.00	0.10%	$0.06	$8	$18
80	Explosive Kit	7 000	180	2.57	2	7 000	2	$180	2.57	0.10%	$0.58	$292	$472
81	Demolition Kit	7 600	200	2.63	2	7 600	2	$200	2.63	0.10%	$0.63	$317	$517
82	Demolition Equipment Set	500	10	2.00	10	500	10	$ 10	2.00	0.10%	$0.04	$4	$14
83	Mine Breaching Equipment Set	7 000	140.00	2.00	10	7 000	10	$ 140	2.00	0.10%	$0.58	$59	$199
84	PFM optical fixation of landmines for orientation/plotting	1 510	150.00	9.93	7	1 510	7	$ 150	9.93	0.10%	$0.13	$18	$168
85	PFM optical fixation of landmines for orientation/plotting	1 510	150	9.93	7	1 510	7	$ 150	9.93	0.10%	$0.13	$18	$168
86	DST-451 optical range finder	774	0	0.00	5	774	5	$ -	0.00	0.10%	$0.06	$13	$13
87	Permissible Blasters Digital Ohmmeter	514	5	1.00	7	514	7	$ 5	1.00	0.10%	$0.04	$6	$11
88	Blasting machine	828	8	1.00	8	828	8	$ 8	1.00	0.10%	$0.07	$9	$17
89	Cable reel with 200M wire	1 550	16	1.00	8	1 550	8	$ 16	1.00	0.10%	$0.13	$16	$32
90	Digital Camera	2 250	37	1.63	2	2 250	2	$ 55	2.44	0.10%	$0.19	$94	$149
91	Digital camera	2 250	55	2.44	2	2 250	2	$55	2.44	0.10%	$0.19	$94	$149
92	Digital camera		0			750	2	$ -	0.00	0.10%	$0.06	$31	$31
93	Video Camera	2 000	100	5.00	2	2 000	2	$100	5.00	0.10%	$0.17	$84	$184
94	Ultrasounder	1 875	63	3.36	5	1 875	5	$63	3.36	0.10%	$0.16	$31	$94
95	Ultrasounder	1 875	125	6.67	5	1 875	5	$ 63	3.33	0.10%	$0.16	$31	$94
	Others												
96	Strong box fire proof safe	3 470	36	1.04	2	3 470	20	$36	1.04	0.10%	$0.29	$15	$51
97	Small Arms Ammunition Incinerator	22 473	323	1.44	5	TBD - under review							$0
98	Alcohol Meter	687	39	5.68	2	687.00	2	39	5.68	0.50%	$0.29	$29	$68
99	Laser Speed Gun	2580	52	2.015504	5	2 580.00	5	52	2.016	0.50%	$1.08	$44	$96
100	Mobile Crime Lab	27476	675	2.456689	5	TBD - under review							
101	Company Tactical Set	8674	145	1.671862	10	8 674.00	10	145	1.672	0.10%	$0.72	$73	$218
102	Handheld Shooting Equipment	974	65	6.673511	10	974.00	10	16	1.643	0.10%	$0.08	$8	$24
103	Scuba Diving Set	3323	47	1.414385	1.5	3 323.00	1.5	47	1.414	0.50%	$1.36	$186	$233

Annex I.C.4

Special cases: explosive ordnance disposal and demining equipment

Issue

1. In some United Nations missions there is a need for the operational deployment of explosive ordnance disposal and demining capabilities at force level. Where such capabilities are required in a particular United Nations mission, there are no instructions regarding the proper structure for these special units and their equipment holdings are not specified. The Contingent-Owned Equipment Manual provides the guidance only for reimbursements of explosive ordnance disposal capabilities provided at a unit or national contingent level under self-sustainment. Even in this case, the standards for the proper structure of the unit or team and its equipment are missing. This results in a number of special cases for explosive ordnance disposal and demining equipment for units throughout United Nations missions, which the United Nations Secretariat has to manage. From the discussion, with the focal point, extensively supported by the specialty area expert from the Secretariat, the following issues and conclusions arise:

(a) There is a need to maintain a strict distinction between units and teams with explosive ordnance disposal capability and the less capable demining units, as they fulfil different tasks;

(b) At the contingent or unit level, explosive ordnance disposal capability can be reimbursed as a part of self-sustainment, but only where this has been specifically required as a capability by the United Nations. This case is applicable preferably for a restricted period of time, basically during the initial stage of mission deployment if there is an operational need. If explosive ordnance disposal tasks and activities of a particular explosive ordnance disposal unit are required to cross the unit or contingent limits, they should be recognized as force-level activities. Standards and establishments for such units with force-level responsibilities are required to be produced for basic generic explosive ordnance disposal teams (including a new group of standard generic explosive ordnance disposal equipment listed under major equipment) and for force elements;

(c) Explosive ordnance disposal units and demining units at a force level should be mobile and self-sustainable for deployment throughout the mission operational area. An explosive ordnance disposal unit should be created from basic generic explosive ordnance disposal teams and sized according to the operational needs of a particular mission. In order to provide a basic guidance for force generation, it would be useful to set a recommended list of equipment required for such a unit;

(d) Demining will not always be a specific part of any United Nations mission. Requirements on demining capabilities should be established during the mission definition and force-generation process. Although partially standardized, the majority of high-performance demining equipment should be negotiated as special cases depending on the operational requirements for a particular United Nations mission;

(e) The training cost for dogs used in explosive ordnance disposal and demining tasks varies significantly from country to country. The introduction of

specially trained dogs to the operational area is so specific that it should stay as a special case.

Proposal

2. A copy of the International Mine Action Standard on personal protection equipment (IMAS 10.30, dated 1 October 2001) is attached as annex I.C.8.

(a) Explosive ordnance disposal and demining equipment (including personal protection equipment) should be placed in the major equipment schedule for units with force-level responsibilities;

(b) Explosive ordnance disposal and demining equipment should be subsequently identified as 15 line items, as provided in annex I.C.5;

(c) The recommended explosive ordnance disposal team structure and list of equipment for operational deployment as a force-level unit (according to annex I.C.6) to be included in the Contingent-Owned Equipment Manual and be used as a guide in mission planning and force-generation process. If equipment named in the recommended list is not provided or available by the explosive ordnance disposal unit, force-level support should be arranged;

(d) A generic demining platoon should be established and included in the Contingent-Owned Equipment Manual in order to facilitate force-generation process. Special requirements on unit should be negotiated during a mission preparation period. Structure of a generic demining platoon is listed in annex I.C.7;

(e) Cost of transportation of explosives and cost of explosives related to explosive ordnance disposal activities should be reimbursed according to provisions given in the Contingent-Owned Equipment Manual, as they are not included in the proposed explosive ordnance disposal and demining equipment reimbursement rates for major equipment.

Recommendations

3. It is recommended that the 2004 Working Group on Contingent-Owned Equipment establish revised explosive ordnance disposal and demining equipment as a specific category within the reimbursements rates for major equipment for explosive ordnance disposal and demining units with force-level responsibilities (see annex I.C.2, p. 2).

4. It is recommended that the initial generic fair market value and useful life estimate be based on the aggregation of existing special cases and recommendations of specialty area experts from the United Nations Secretariat, as given in annex I.C.5 and merged into annex I.C.2, page 2.

5. It is recommended that the Working Group on Contingent-Owned Equipment will include the definitions and standards of explosive ordnance disposal and demining equipment into the Contingent-Owned Equipment Manual.

6. It is recommended that the Working Group include the recommended explosive ordnance disposal team structure and list of equipment for operational deployment and generic demining platoon structure (given in annexes I.C.6 and I.C.7) into the Contingent-Owned Equipment Manual, in order to facilitate the force-generation process.

7. It is recommended that the operational requirement for dogs, expensive demining equipment and additional operational requirements be negotiated within the memorandum of understanding, on an individual basis, as deemed necessary by the United Nations and the troop-contributing countries.

Annex I.C.5

Standards and definitions for the explosive ordnance disposal and demining equipment category

Item	*Class/ sub-item*	*GFMV US dollars*	*Expected life*	*Remarks*
Metal detector		3 000	5 years	A device that detects the presence of metal (metal content of land mines and unexploded ordnance). Device includes prodders, consumables, and support items.
Mine detector		10 000	5 years	A device that detects and measures more than just the metal content of land mines and unexploded ordnance, i.e. shape or explosive content as well. Device includes prodders, consumables, and support items.
Bomb locator		7 000	5 years	A device that detects large metal content at great depth, minimum 2 m in depth.
EOD suit	Light	6 500	5 years	A light EOD suit can be described as one that has a minimum V50 rating of 1000 m/sec for the chest and groin when using full suit protection, i.e. all chest plates added. Different parts of the suit may have lower V50 ratings. A suit of this protection level is, however, not recommended for EOD work as it compromises safety. A suit of this level of protection can be used for general demining operations, but is not essential.
	Heavy	10 000	5 years	A heavy suit can be described as one that has a V50 rating of 1600 m/sec or over for the chest and groin area, with all additional plates inserted or maximum protection added. Different parts of the suit may have lower V50 rating.
EOD helmet and visor	Light	2 850	5 years	The helmet and visor are separate to the light EOD suit. A light helmet should have a minimum V 50 rating of 450 m/sec for the helmet and greater than 250 m/sec for the visor. This price does not include an integrated communications system.
	Heavy	4 500	5 years	The helmet and visor that is compatible to the heavy EOD suit should have a minimum V50 rating of 780 m/sec for the visor and a V50 rating greater than 450.m/sec for the helmet. The price shown includes an environmental awareness system.

Item	*Class/ sub-item*	*GFMV US dollars*	*Expected life*	*Remarks*
Demining personal protection set	Demining protective helmet and visor	200	6 months for visor in full use 2 years for the helmet	These are normally purchased as a pair. The helmet is not a ballistic helmet but more a light shell to hold the visor. The visor is the item that normally wears out and can be replaced. A visor costs about $100.00 for replacement. Specifications for the visor should be as specified in IMAS. Ballistic protection is not normally required, nor recommended, for demining operations.
	Demining protective shoes	500	2 years	Several different types of reinforced shoe, or "mine boot", are made. They are not always recommended or encouraged as they can give a feeling of false security to deminers. This price reflects a full boot type equipment. Inflated cushions are not recommended nor included in this subcategory.
	Demining protective vest/jacket	625	2 years	This is for a flak jacket (chest) type protection. Specifications are as per IMAS. It can be replaced with apron/trousers as an alternative.
	Demining protective apron/trousers	625	2 years	An apron is the normal item used. Trousers are not common. An apron will provide some chest and groin protection. Minimum protection level should be as per IMAS for vest or flak jacket type protection. Demining protective vest/jacket can be an alternative.
	Reinforced gloves	150	2 years	These are specially reinforced mittens or gloves, usually made of kevlar or some other strength fabric. Coned hand protection could also be provided.
	Set total	**1 475**		

Notes

1. Initial generic fair market values (GFMV) and estimates of useful life are based on aggregation of existing "special cases" and recommendations of the speciality area experts from the United Nations secretariat.
2. International Mine Action Standards (IMAS) define minimum acceptable standards for face and body protection for humanitarian deminers. IMAS are available at www.mineactionstandards.org
3. Specialist advice should always be sought to confirm suitability of equipment to task and environment. In addition, before deployment, specialist advice should be sought to recommend equipment capabilities.
4. The requirement for explosive ordnance disposal (EOD) and demining equipment will normally be greatest at the beginning of a mission. It may therefore, be necessary to review the holdings and reduce them after a period of time. An analysis of the tasking schedule and time on task will indicate usage and reflect requirement.

Annex I.C.6

Basic explosive ordnance disposal team[a] equipment list

Operational deployment[b]

Item	*Item*	*Quantity*	*Remarks*
Communications equipment			
1	Mobile HF radio	1	
2	Hand-held, portable, VHF radio	3	
3	Hand-held, portable, VHF radio battery chargers	2	
4	Hand-held, portable, VHF radio battery charger vehicle adapter	2	
5	Hand-held, portable, VHF radio spare battery	2	
6	Global positioning system	2	
Medical equipment			
7	First aid kit	1	Basic first aid pack; plasters, antiseptic gauze, etc. One per vehicle
8	**Trauma pack**[c]	1	
9	Oxygen cylinder, 5 litre		
10	Oxygen regulator min — 10 litres/min		
11	Face mask with reservoir		
12	Fire blanket	1	
13	Stretcher	1	
14	Body bag	2	Estimated cost
Manuals and publications			
15	**Standard operating procedures demining and explosive ordnance disposal**	1	Latest amendments
16	**Reports and returns**	2 sets	Latest format
17	**Unexploded ordnance identification guide**	2	Theatre specific. Must include recommended and approved render-safe procedures
18	**Mapping**	2 sets	1:25 000 and 1:10 00. Entire area of responsibility
19	**Dictionary**	1	
Detection equipment			
20	**Hand-held minimum metal detector**	2	E.g. Ebinger 420 GC with accessory pack and explosive ordnance disposal search head
22	**Spare battery section for detector**	2	E.g. Ebinger 420 GC
23	**Large loop unexploded ordnance detector**	1	E.g. Ebinger UPEX 720D
24	**Laser pen**	1	Standard laser pen used for conducting briefs
25	**Prodder**	4	

Item	*Item*	*Quantity*	*Remarks*
Personal protective equipment			
26	**Face visor**	5	As per international mine action standards
27	**Protective vest**	5	As per international mine action standards
Personal equipment			
28	Coverall	4	Red, cotton, reinforced knees and elbows
29	Coverall	1	Green, cotton, reinforced knees and elbows
30	Water bottle	5	Plastic with cup
31	Water bottle pouch	5	Canvas, non-metallic
32	Web belt	5	Canvas, non-metallic
33	Utility pouch	5	Canvas, non-metallic
34	Hat, floppy	5	Cotton
35	Personal kit bag	5	Canvas, 40-litre capacity
36	Day sack	5	
37	Knife, fork, spoon	5	
38	Enamel mug	5	
39	Plate and bowl set	5	
40	Small towel	5	Cotton
41	Large towel	5	Cotton/polyester
42	Socks pair	10	Cotton
43	Gloves, leather, heavy duty	4	
Explosive ordnance disposal equipment			
44	**Crimping tool**	2	(2 in each packet)
45	**Leathermans multi-tool**	1	
46	**Disrupter**	1	
47	**Cartridges and slugs for disrupter**	1 set	
48	**Hook and line set**	1 set	
Equipment, general			
Explosive ordnance disposal			
49	Binoculars	2	E.g. Celestron 10x50 Regal Series — field of view 5.0°, eye relief 20 mm, near focus 8m
50	Swiftscope	1	E.g. Vanguard 25 x spotting scope kit — tripod, case, 25x60 ZCF, focusing range 30 m to infinity
51	**Magelite Torch, large, 3D cell**	2	E.g. Allen Cat No. 120-244
52	**Demolition firing device (exploder)**	1	
53	**Demolition firing device (exploder) spare battery**	1	
54	**Demolition firing device (exploder) multiple-battery charger**	1	
55	**Ohmmeter**	1	
56	**Firing cable and reel**	2	

Item	*Item*	*Quantity*	*Remarks*
57	**Unexploded ordnance container**	1	Metal, wood-lined, dimensions: 24" x 15" x 17"
58	**Explosive storage box**	1	Metal, green, wood-lined, dimensions: 24" x 15" x 17"
59	**Detonator transit box**	1	Metal, wood-lined, red, dimensions: 10" x 12" x 5.5"
60	**Digital camera**	1	
61	**Mine markers**	50	Canvas, pyramid style
62	**Warning flag, red**	4	
63	**Paint spray**	4 cans	
Tools			
64	Excavation/general tool set, consisting of:	1	
	Shovel, round nose, 2 kg		
	Pick, 560 mm head, 2.5 kg		
	Pry Bar, 915 mm long, 7 kg		
	Sledge hammer, 700 mm, 3.2 kg		
	Club hammer, 1.8 kg		
	Chisel, flat, 29 mm x 305 mm		
	Scraper, 125 mm bl, long handle		
65	Fire extinguisher, 6 kg	2	Non-liquid
66	Carry bags	5	Canvas, 40-litre capacity
67	Water Jerry Can, 20-litre	2	
68	Fuel Jerry Can, 20-litre	1	
Camp stores			
69	Tent, accommodation, 2-man	3	Rapid assembly with groundsheet, e.g. Kelty Cyclone 2. Can be replaced with locally purchased tent
70	Mosquito net	5	Individual
71	Lantern	2	E.g. Deitz jupiter lantern — 14 candle power, kerosene or lamp oil, 50-hour burn time
72	Sleeping bag	5	Three-season
73	Folding chair	5	
74	Folding table, 6'x6'	1	
75	Frying pan, medium	1	
76	Spatula	1	
77	Ladle, medium	1	
78	Wooden spoon, medium	1	
79	Cooking pot, medium	1	
80	Cooking pot, small	1	
81	Gas stove	1	Portable, double hob with connector and hose

Item	*Item*	*Quantity*	*Remarks*
82	Gas bottle	1	5-litre
83	Gas regulator	1	
84	Secateurs	2	
85	Tape measure, 5 m	2	
86	Tape measure, 50 m	2	
87	Plastic ruler, 30 cm	2	
Ammunition, explosives and explosive accessories[d]			
88	**Plastic Explosive**	25 kg	
89	**Charge linear cutting, 120g**	5 m	
90	**Charge linear cutting, 80g**	5 m	
91	**Charge linear cutting, 40g**	5 m	
92	**Electric detonators**	40	
93	**Non-electric detonators**	40	
94	**Shaped charge — Swiss Munitions explosive ordnance disposal 20**	50	
95	**Shaped charge — Swiss Munitions explosive ordnance disposal 33**	10	
96	**Safety fuse**	10 rolls	Burn time between 36-44s/30 cm (1ft)
97	**Detonating cord**	400 m	
Expense stores			
98	Sandbags	200	
99	Firing cable, black/tan	500m or 4 reels	
100	Black masking tape	2 reels	
101	Insulating tape, black	2 reels	
102	Insulating tape, red	2 reels	
103	14 gauge wire	50m	
104	Cylumes, green	20	
105	Cylumes, red	20	
106	Batteries, various	N/A	
107	Talcum powder	2 packs	
108	Latex gloves, medical	1 box	
109	Plastic bags	20	Hardwearing
110	Food rations	4	48 hours' worth
111	Stationery	N/A	
112	Kerosene and other fuels	N/A	

Item	*Item*	*Quantity*	*Remarks*
Vehicles			
113	**4x4 personal vehicle, spare tyre, basic spare set, winch, roof rack**	2	One for paramedic and one for personnel and equipment, with inner tubes and wheel rims, fuses, plugs, lamps, filters, etc.
114	**Trailer**	1	½ ton, hardtop
115	**Trailer, spare tyre**	2	With inner tubes and wheel rims

[a] An explosive ordnance disposal team is comprised of an explosive ordnance disposal No. 1 (Team leader/explosive ordnance disposal technician), and explosive ordnance disposal No. 2 (explosive ordnance disposal technician), one driver, one interpreter and one Paramedic, for a total of five individuals. The level of explosive ordnance disposal qualification should be level 4 and 3, according to the International Mine Action Standards definition contained in document IMAS 09.30 (see www.mineactionstandards.org).

[b] This list is based on an existing mission explosive ordnance disposal team and has proven adequate for most general explosive ordnance disposal tasks. For a capability to deal with large aircraft bombs and deep buried bombs, this explosive ordnance disposal team kit would need reinforcing on a case-by-case basis (e.g. with heavier bomb suits, remote controlled robots, fuse extractors, water cannons, etc.).
The list applies to an explosive ordnance disposal team in an operational setting and is equipped for full deployment. It should be used as a basis for discussion.

[c] The bolded items (Nos. 8, 15-19, 20-27, 44-48, 51-59, 61-63, 88-97) were highlighted to show them as specific items for explosive ordnance disposal units. All other items could be considered applicable to other units.

[d] The quantities given here are for the deployment of one team in an operational setting. Clearly, there will be a requirement to expand holdings of these stores to maintain operational effectiveness over a prolonged period of time. Team holdings may have to be revised in the light of the number of tasks being undertaken in any given period. All explosives and explosive accessories will be transported in their original packaging.

Annex I.C.7

Generic demining platoon major demining equipment requirements

Item	*Number*	*Note*
Personnel	30 (Max)	The basic demining unit is a platoon. A demining platoon consists of deminers and support staff. A number of platoons can form a company. Support staff will include the commander and second in command, cook and drivers
Metal detectors	20	Detection ranges (the following are the minimum requirements): – Detect very small ferrous, non ferrous metal content or alloy (0.15g) up to a depth to be specified for each mission; – The metal detector must detect mines in real time (instantaneously) so that any mine located by the detector will be indicated to the operator before he steps on it.
Mine prodders	30	The mine probe or prodder should be of a light-weight material that is sharp and strong enough to be inserted with one hand to a depth of 100 mm without deflection.
Mine marking material	20 sets	The marking material should be according to NATO standard STANAG 2036 (see also IMAS 08.40).
Personal protective equipment	30	The minimum requirements of personnel protective equipment: (a) Ballistic body armour (flak jacket/fragmentation vest/body armour) capable of withstanding a NATO STANAG 2920 v50 rating (dry) of 450 m/s for 1.102 g fragments (see also IMAS 10.30); (b) A full-face visor. However, if an analysis of the threat indicates that a full face visor would provide inadequate protection across a full 360° threat spectrum then a helmet should be provided that has a ballistic rating equivalent to the specifications for ballistic body armour selected; (c) Eye protection should be equal to that offered by 5 mm of untreated polycarbonate, capable of retaining integrity against the blast effects of 240g of TNT at 60 cm, providing full frontal coverage of face and throat in conjunction with specified frontal protection ensemble (see also IMAS 10.30).
Global positioning system	2	
Tools (sets)	20	Tools consist of vegetation cutters, trowel or digging tool, lane tape, lane limit marker, string, etc.
Demolition set	1	Each platoon should have a supply of markers, explosives, electronic and safety fuse detonators, detcord, safety fuse, shaped charges, demolition firing device and spare battery, firing cable, crimping tool, leatherman tools, ohmmeter, explosive storage box, detonator transit box and sandbags.
The following are frequently required but should be dealt with on a case-by-case basis as special items.		
Ambulances		The minimum medical cover should be as follows: (a) a capability to dress traumatic amputation or multiple fragmentation wounds and administer a saline drip, located (with a stretcher) within 5 minutes of the task site (b) a medic (capable of dealing with mine casualties)

Item	*Number*	*Note*
Mechanical mine clearance devices		Could be earth processing machines, flail systems etc.
Explosive detection dogs teams		Each team consists of two dogs and one dog handler plus vehicle and support
Explosive ordnance disposal teams		Explosive ordnance disposal teams qualified to level 2 explosive ordnance disposal standard, ideally level 3, according to IMAS 09.30 "Explosive ordnance disposal" which should have the capability (qualifications, tools, protective clothing and equipment) and mobility to go to any location and undertake in situ RSP/EOD, when required.

Annex I.C.8

International Mine Action Standard (First edition, 1 October 2001)

Personal protective equipment

Foreword

1. In July 1996, international standards for humanitarian mine-clearance programmes were proposed by working groups at a conference in Denmark. Criteria were prescribed for all aspects of mine clearance, standards were recommended and a new universal definition of "clearance" was agreed. In late 1996, the principles proposed in Denmark were developed by a United Nations-led working group into International Standards for Humanitarian Mine Clearance Operations. A first edition of these standards was issued by the United Nations Mine Action Service in March 1997.

2. This second edition reflects changes to operational procedures, practices and norms which have occurred over the past three years. The scope of these standards has been expanded to include the other components of mine action, in particular those of mine-risk education and victim assistance.

3. The United Nations has a general responsibility for enabling and encouraging the effective management of mine-action programmes, including the development and maintenance of standards. The United Nations Mine Action Service is the office within the United Nations Secretariat responsible for the development and maintenance of international mine-action standards (IMAS).

4. The work of preparing, reviewing and revising these standards is conducted by technical committees, with the support of international, governmental and non-governmental organizations. The latest version of each standard, together with information on the work of the technical committees, can be found at www.mineactionstandards.org. The Standard will be reviewed at least every three years to reflect developing mine-action norms and practices and to incorporate changes to international regulations and requirements.

Introduction

5. The needs to reduce risk and to provide a safe working environment are fundamental principles of mine-action management (see the Standard 10.10). Risk reduction involves a combination of safe working practices and operating procedures, effective supervision and control, appropriate education and training, equipment of inherently safe design, and the provision of effective personal protective equipment and clothing.

6. As a minimum, all employees involved in demining should be provided with comfortable and serviceable clothing and footwear appropriate to the task and local conditions.

7. Personal protective equipment should be regarded as a "last resort" to protect against the effects of mine and unexploded ordnance hazards. It should be the final protective measure after all planning, training and procedural efforts to reduce risk have been taken. There are a number of reasons for this approach. First, personal

protective equipment protects only the person wearing it, whereas measures controlling the risk at the source can protect everyone at the demining workplace. Second, theoretical maximum levels of protection are seldom achieved with the equipment in practice, and the actual level of protection is difficult to assess; effective protection is only achieved by suitable personal protective equipment, that is correctly fitted, properly maintained and used. And third, such equipment may restrict the wearer to some extent by limiting mobility or visibility, or by requiring that additional weight be carried.

8. The risk to deminers comes principally from anti-personnel blast mines, anti-personnel fragmentation mines, anti-tank mines and unexploded ordnance. Anti-personnel blast mines are the most abundant mines encountered in humanitarian demining and cause the greatest number of injuries. At close quarters, anti-personnel fragmentation mines and anti-tank mines outmatch the personal protective equipment currently available. Due to the area effect of such mines, they also have the potential to cause "secondary victims". In general, when unexploded ordnance munitions are encountered in humanitarian demining, they have already malfunctioned. They are usually high in metal content, on or near the surface and constitute less of a hazard than mines. The varied nature of unexploded ordnance means that the hazard is best dealt with procedurally, rather than relying on personal protection equipment designed primarily for humanitarian demining.

1. Scope

9. This Standard provides specifications and guidance to national mine-action authorities and demining organizations on the minimum requirements of personal protective equipment, including protective clothing, for use in mine action.

10. It does not provide guidance on the design characteristics of personal protective equipment garments, or on test and evaluation procedures. General requirements for such equipment are included in document ISO/DIS14876-1: 1999 (E) of the International Organization for Standardization (ISO).

2. References

11. A list of normative references is given in annex A. Normative references are important documents to which reference is made in this Standard and which form part of its provisions.

3. Terms and definitions

12. A list of terms and definitions used in this Standard is given in annex B. A complete glossary of all the terms and definitions used in the International Mine Action Standards series is given in document IMAS 04.10.

13. In the series of standards, the words "shall", "should" and "may" are used to indicate the intended degree of compliance. This use is consistent with the language used in ISO standards and guidelines.

(a) "Shall" is used to indicate requirements, methods or specifications that are to be applied in order to conform to the standard;

(b) "Should" is used to indicate the preferred requirements, methods or specifications;

(c) "May" is used to indicate a possible method or course of action.

14. The term "national mine-action authority or authorities" refers to the government department(s), organization(s) or institution(s) in each mine-affected country charged with the regulation, management and coordination of mine action. In most cases, the national mine-action centre or its equivalent will act as, or on behalf of, the "national mine-action authority".

15. The term "employer" refers to any organization (Government, non-governmental organization or commercial entity) responsible for implementing demining projects or tasks. The employer may be a prime contractor, subcontractor, consultant or agent.

16. The term "employee" refers to people who work for an employer. Employees may be involved in management, operational or support activities.

17. The term "personal protective equipment" refers to all equipment and clothing designed to provide protection, which is intended to be worn or held by an employee at work and which protects him or her against one or more risks to his or her safety or health.

4. Personal protective equipment requirements

4.1 General

18. The levels of PPE provided for use in hazardous areas shall be based on a number of factors including: the local risk(s), operational procedures and practices and local environmental conditions. (Guidelines on the process of risk assessment and risk reduction are given in ISO Guide 51.)

19. Training shall be provided on the proper use, maintenance and storage of the personal protective equipment in use within the demining organization. Facilities should be provided for its proper storage and carriage. Equipment shall be examined on a regular basis to ensure that it is suitable for use.

4.2 Blast protection

20. Personal protective equipment should be capable of protecting against the blast effects of 240 gm of TNT at stand-off distances, for each item of PPE, appropriate to the activity performed in accordance with standard operating procedures. Equipment provided to reduce the risk from such a hazard shall include, as a minimum:

(a) Frontal protection, appropriate to the activity, capable of protecting against the blast effects of 240 gm of TNT at 30 cm from the closest part of the body;

(b) Eye protection capable of retaining integrity against the blast effects of 240 gm of TNT at 60 cm, providing full frontal coverage of the face and throat as part of the specified frontal protection ensemble.

Note. A technical note for mine action will be developed to lay down the test and evaluation protocols to be followed during the test regime of personal protective equipment.

Note. Although this Standard lays down distances at which the personal protective equipment must be effective, it must be emphasized that this does not imply to deminers

that they will be safe at such distances. Distance itself is an excellent attenuator of blast effects and the further away from an undesired explosive event the better!

21. The frontal protection ensemble provided to employees, whether required to kneel, sit or squat, shall be designed to cover the eyes, throat (frontal neck), chest, abdomen and genitals. Where standard operating procedures permit employees to work in the kneeling or squatting position, the frontal protection ensemble should cover the front of the thighs.

22. Hand tools should be constructed in such a way that their separation or fragmentation resulting from the detonation of an anti-personnel blast-mine incident is reduced to a minimum. They should be used with appropriate hand protection, such as a hand-shield or gloves. Hand tools should be designed to be used at a low angle to the ground and should provide adequate stand-off from an anticipated point of detonation.

23. During the risk-reduction process, demining organizations may consider providing blast-proof boots for the protection of feet and lower limbs, where there is a significant risk that cannot be reduced by standard operating procedures alone, provided that the blast boots being considered are proven to be effective in reducing that risk.

Note. The effectiveness and operational benefits of mine boots is still a contentious issue within the mine-clearance community, and there are wide-ranging views and opinions on their use. Nevertheless, mine boots do exist, and therefore demining organizations may wish to evaluate their suitability for their particular operational scenario during the planning phase of a clearance operation. To date, only one independent trial (sponsored by the United States Department of State) has been conducted, which identified that the cost of provision and replacement was high, while the benefits are unproven. There is currently a danger that they offer "false security". The situation will be monitored and reviewed during the ongoing review process of international mine-action standards and any updates will be distributed through the technical note for mine action.

4.3 Fragmentation protection

24. Fragmentation mines currently outmatch all but specialist explosive ordnance disposal ensembles, which emphasizes the initial need to minimize risk procedurally via appropriate standard operating procedures. Protection should nevertheless be provided against non-designed fragmentation from other mines (such as that from plastic-bodied blast mines), and to potential secondary victims where such a threat cannot be removed procedurally. Personal protective equipment provided to reduce the risk from such a hazard should include, as a minimum:

(a) Ballistic body armour with a STANAG 2920 v50 rating (dry) of 450m/s for 1.102g fragments. (Such tests for ballistic protection do not realistically replicate mine effects, but will continue to be used until an accepted alternative is developed as an international standard.);

(b) A full-face visor, as described in clause 4.2 (b) above. However, if an analysis of the threat using the criteria set out in these guidelines and in the document IMAS 10.10 indicates that a full face visor would provide inadequate protection across a full 3600 threat spectrum, then a helmet should be worn. The helmet should have a ballistic rating similar to the ballistic body armour selected by the demining organization.

Note. Eye protection should be no less than that offered by 5mm of untreated polycarbonate. It should provide full frontal coverage of face and throat as part of the specified frontal protection ensemble. (If the body protection is fitted with an "overlap", then the visor should be capable of fitting behind this "overlap" when in use).

Note. A technical note for mine action will be developed to lay down the test and evaluation protocols to be followed during the test regime of personal protective equipment.

4.4 Explosive ordnance disposal clearance sites

25. When engaged in the clearance of unexploded ordnance or other hazardous ordnance, an enhanced level of protection may be necessary. This should be defined in standard operating procedures and may include conventional body armour or other specialist personal protective equipment ensembles.

5. Responsibilities

5.1 General requirements

26. National mine-action authorities and employers (Governments, non-governmental organizations and commercial entities) shall establish and maintain policy, standards and guidelines on the minimum requirements of personal protective equipment for use in national mine-action programmes. This should distinguish between the obligations and responsibilities at the national level and those of the employer and employee as set out below.

5.2 National responsibilities

27. The national mine-action authority shall:

(a) Establish and maintain national standards to be applied for personal protective equipment;

(b) Monitor the application of standards;

(c) Undertake periodic reviews of the national standards for personal protective equipment and the technologies available to reduce risks.

5.3 Employers' responsibilities

28. Demining organizations shall:

(a) Apply the documented national mine-action authority standards for personal protective equipment;

(b) Meet, or exceed, the minimum requirements for the provision of personal protective equipment. In this regard, provide such equipment to employees which is serviceable and appropriate to the risk, local operational procedures and environmental conditions;

(c) Provide training and supervision in the correct use and maintenance of the equipment;

(d) Establish and maintain standard operating procedures that specify care and maintenance requirements;

(e) Provide suitable facilities for the storage, maintenance and carriage of personal protective equipment;

(f) Establish and maintain documented standard operating procedures to undertake periodic reviews of personal protective equipment.

In the absence of a national mine-action authority or authorities, the demining organization should assume additional responsibilities. These include, but are not restricted to:

(a) Issuing, maintaining and updating their own standards to be applied for personal protective equipment;

(b) Cooperating with other employers in the same country to ensure consistency of standards for the use and maintenance of personal protective equipment;

(c) Assisting the host nation, during the establishment of a national mine-action authority, in framing national standards for personal protective equipment.

5.4 Employees' obligations

29. Employees of demining organizations shall:

(a) Use personal protective equipment in accordance with the requirements specified by their employers and the manufacturer's specification for the equipment, including the use of facilities provided for its storage and carriage;

(b) Maintain the personal protective equipment in accordance with the demining organization's standard operating procedures and/or the manufacture's specifications or guidelines;

(c) Report to the employer problems with the equipment or suggested improvements to the standard operating procedures that may reduce the requirement for personal protective equipment, or improvements in its design or application.

Annex A (normative) references

30. The following normative documents contain provisions, which, through reference in this text, constitute provisions of this part of the standard. For dated references, subsequent amendments to or revisions of any of these publications do not apply. However, parties to agreements based on this part of the standard are encouraged to investigate the possibility of applying the most recent editions of the normative documents indicated below. For undated references, the latest edition of the normative document referred to applies. Members of ISO and the International Electrotechnical Commission maintain registers of currently valid ISO or EN:

(a) ISO Guide 51 — Safety aspects — guidelines for their inclusion in standards;

(b) ISO/DIS 14876-1:1999 (E) — protective clothing — body armour — Part 1: General requirements;

(c) IMAS 10.10 S&OH — General requirements;

(d) STANAG 2920.

31. The latest version or edition of these references should be used. The Geneva International Centre for Humanitarian Mining holds copies of all references used in this standard. A register of the latest version or edition of the IMAS standards, guides and references is maintained by the Centre, and can be read on the IMAS web site (see www.mineactionstandards.org). National mine-action authorities, employers and other interested bodies and organizations should obtain copies before commencing mine-action programmes.

Annex B (informative) terms and definitions

B.1.1
Accident

An undesired event which results in harm.

Note. Modified from definition in OHSAS 18001:1999.

B.1.2
Demining accident

An accident at a demining workplace involving a mine or unexploded ordnance hazard (c.f. mine accident).

B.1.3
Demining incident

An incident at a demining workplace involving a mine or unexploded ordnance hazard (cf. mine incident).

B.1.4
Demining worker

All employees, including public servants, qualified and employed to undertake demining activities or work at a demining workplace.

B.1.5
Demining workplace

Workplace where demining activities are undertaken.

Note. Includes sites where survey, clearance and explosive ordnance disposal activities are undertaken, including centralized disposal sites used for the destruction of mines and unexploded ordnance identified and removed during clearance operations.

B.1.6
Ensemble

The group of protective clothing designed to be worn as a protective measure.

B.1.7
Incident

An event that gives rise to an accident or has the potential to lead to an accident [C155].

B.1.8
Mine accident

An accident away from the demining workplace involving a mine or unexploded ordnance hazard (cf. demining accident).

B.1.9
Mine incident

An incident away from the demining workplace involving a mine or unexploded ordnance hazard (cf. demining incident).

B.1.10
Personal protective equipment

All equipment and clothing designed to provide protection, which is intended to be worn or held by a employee at work and which protects him or her against one or more risks to his or her safety or health.

B.1.11
Protective measure

Means used to reduce risk [ISO Guide 51:1999(E)].

B.1.12
Risk

The combination of the probability of occurrence of harm and the severity of that harm [ISO Guide 51:1999(E)].

B.1.13
Workplace

All places where workers need to be or to go by reason of their work and which are under the direct or indirect control of the employer.

Annex I.C.9

"Special cases": riot control equipment

Issue

1. Currently, riot equipment is listed as a special case for three military missions. Riot equipment is not a standard requirement for military personnel, as dealing with such activities is usually a police responsibility. Where military contingents are required to hold a contingency stock of riot equipment, all items are additional to those reimbursed under individual or self-sustainment rates. Police contingents deploy with a personal set of riot gear as part of their individual equipment, as the role is part of their prime purpose, and the equipment is therefore included in their personal clothing, gear and equipment allowance at a rate of $68 per person per month. However, the additional equipment necessary to equip platoon or company groups are major equipment items.

2. It is desired to remove riot equipment from special cases and place it as a standard element within major equipment.

Proposal

3. Riot control equipment should be placed in the major equipment schedule.

4. Riot control equipment should be subsequently identified as three line items, as follows:

(a) Personnel set. For military forces only, in addition to "soldiers' kit", where tasking is required in addition to the prime purpose. To be held and accounted for in section sets of ten, individual soldiers within sections will be issued a single set on an "as-required basis", when tasked with riot control duty. Each set includes:

1. Elbow, knee and shoulder protection (additional to body armour);
2. Helmet with visor (visor may be attached to existing helmet or held as a complete item);
3. Shield (plastic, transparent to national standard);
4. Baton;
5. Gas mask (if not otherwise carried);
6. **Cost** (for set of ten) including gas mask — US$ 25,000
7. **Cost** (for set of ten) when gas mask is provided under nuclear, biological, chemical self-sustainment — US$ 15,000
8. **Life expectancy** — **two years operational**

(b) Platoon set. For police or military contingents. To be issued to groups of two or more sections (equipped in personal sets), tasked as a platoon, under the control of an officer, each set includes:

		United States dollars each
1.	Tear gas launchers (x 4)	1 150
2.	Loudspeakers (x 3)	125
3.	Hand-held searchlights (x 6)	85
4.	Hand-held metal detectors (x 6)	100
5.	Signal pistol (x 3)	180
6.	Taser (advanced pistol) (x 1)	600
7.	**Cost**	**7 225**
8.	**Life expectancy**	**five years operational**

(c) Company set. To be controlled centrally as a force resource and allocated in support of two or more platoons (equipped as above) and to be under the control of a company command officer, each set includes:

9.	Searchlights and generators (set)	3 466
10.	Automatic (TG) Grenade launcher (x 3)	1 977
11.	Signal pistols (x 3)	180
12.	Tear gas launcher (x 4)	1 150
13.	Loudspeakers (x 2)	125
14.	Public address system (set)	1 200
15.	**Cost**	**15 987**
16.	**Life expectancy**	**ten years operational**

Notes

1. The above scale was developed in conjunction with the Office of Mission Support and with the Civilian Police Division's input and agreement.

2. The life expectancy is based on the average of the high use, major expense items.

Recommendations

5. It is recommended that the 2004 Working Group on Contingent-Owned Equipment establish riot control equipment as a specific category within the reimbursement rates for major equipment.

6. It is further suggested that the category consist of three serials of riot control equipment, as follows, with each set consisting of the items listed above:

(a) Personnel set (military contingents only) set of 10,

(i) With gas mask;

(ii) Without gas mask;

(b) Platoon set;

(c) Company set.

7. It is recommended that the initial generic fair market value be based on the aggregation of existing special case rates, as follows:

(a) Personnel set

	United States dollars
(i) With gas mask	25 000
(ii) Without gas mask	15 000
(b) Platoon set	7 725
(c) Company set	15 987

(d) It is recommended that additional operational required items be negotiated within the memorandum of understanding on an individual basis, as deemed necessary by the United Nations and troop-contributing countries.

8. All recommendations mentioned in paragraphs 5 to 7 are merged and presented in annex I.C.2, page 3.

Annex I.D.1

Recommendation for refinement to current major equipment data-collection methodology

Issue

1. Some Member States raised concerns about the flaws in the existing data-collection methodology. A simulation of a proposed modified methodology using to the extent possible background data submitted by Member States under the current data-collection methodology was undertaken during the Working Group.

Background and discussion

2. It is in the interest of all Member States that the review of rates be conducted using the most accurate and efficient methodology possible, recognizing also the need for simplicity and clarity. In this context, the Working Group should encourage and consider any suggested improvements to the methodology.

3. The current method of data collection approved by the General Assembly, based on the recommendations of the post-Phase V Working Group, requires that Member States submit the national cost indices based on the percentage change in the cost of major equipment items in national inventory available for each major equipment category as at 1 January 2000 vis-à-vis the current total cost of that inventory as at 31 December 2002.

4. It is understood that the indices were intended to act as a proxy for inflation when no international standard could be agreed upon. However, the methodology provides no basis nor standard against which to compare these national cost indices.

5. The proposed refined methodology relies on actual cost data, rather than percentage change factors. Essentially it takes the Member State average cost for each type of major equipment and compares it directly to the United Nations dry lease rate. This direct comparison of the Member States' actual costs, immediately and clearly shows the relationship between each Member State's average actual cost per equipment type to the United Nations rates, which the Working Group is mandated to assess. The proposed methodology eliminates the need for historical and quantity data but would, if adopted, require Member States to provide more rigorous current data input for each equipment type. This additional rigour should not, however, be overly burdensome, since Member States would already need to have this information available to produce the percentage change data required under the current methodology.

6. In reviewing the data provided to the Secretariat under the current methodology, it was determined that only nine Member States had provided sufficient background data on actual costs per item to be used in the proposed simulation (data from two Member States was later determined to be insufficient, but data from another Member State was added).

7. In assessing the usefulness of the data selected and the analysis that follows, it should be understood that:

(a) The sample size is very small and not a statistically significant indicator of the overall cost performance for all Member States, or of whether United Nations dry lease rates should change;

(b) The simulation does, however, provide a reasonable basis upon which to compare the impact of the costs reported by the Member States (whose data has been used) on United Nations dry lease rates under the proposed and current methodologies within the major equipment categories and types used;

(c) The type of cost used and age of equipment has a direct impact on the validity of the results produced by proposed methodology. Based on the advice of Member State delegates (whose data was used), costs were assumed to be original undepreciated costs. As such, the useful life established in the Contingent-Owned Equipment Manual was used as a proxy for the life of Member State equipment.

8. In conducting the analysis, the following data adjustments were required to ensure the highest degree of data integrity and usefulness:

(a) Due to time constraints only three major equipment categories were chosen for the simulation. The categories, generators, combat vehicles and engineering vehicles, were chosen because they had the highest number of data inputs from the Member States' data available;

(b) Member State equipment was assigned to major equipment types based on the best information available and verified with Member State delegates to the extent possible;

(c) Some data was not used because it could not be clearly attributed to one of the categories or types of major equipment selected for simulation. For example, some (smaller than 20KVA) generators in Member State submissions could not be used because they actually pertained to self-sustainment;

(d) Equipment types without sufficient data, that is, data from at least 50 per cent of the Member States used in simulation, were removed from the simulation;

(e) The combat vehicles category was later dropped from the simulation, due to the poor quality (lack of attribution) and insufficient amount of data.

Findings

9. The following findings are reflected in the spreadsheet analysis attached as appendix I.

(a) There are clear and often dramatic differences in the costs of different equipment types within the broad United Nations major equipment categories, for example, engineering vehicles, and small versus large generators;

(b) The percentage indices determined by use of the current methodology are not necessarily indicative of the Member State's actual costs in relationship to United Nations dry lease rates. For example, in the table below, under country 1, Engineering vehicles, although the percentage increase/decrease index indicates a 30 per cent increase, the actual costs may be anywhere from 33 per cent higher to 93 per cent lower;

(c) In general, the percent indices reported for these two categories for the Member States included suggested significant percentage increases in the United Nations reimbursement rate, while actual costs range mostly below current United Nations dry lease rates.

Recommendations

10. Based on the results of the simulation, it is the opinion of some Member States that the current methodology could be improved and, therefore, it is recommended that:

(a) The Secretariat be mandated to establish, for the 2007 triennial review, in cooperation with representatives of interested Member States, the protocol, that is the data requirements, formats, instructions etc. necessary to do a complete evaluation of the outlined proposed methodology in comparison to the current methodology, based on all data submitted;

(b) The Secretariat be mandated to invite and accept the submission of other proposals to improve the methodology until 1 December 2005, and to work with the Member States making such proposals to develop the protocol necessary to allow all Member States to make submissions to evaluate such proposals at the 2007 triennial review;

(c) The Secretariat issue instructions for data submission and evaluation of proposed methodology changes by 1 February 2006, to ensure sufficient time for submissions to be made and clarified prior to the commencement of the 2007 Working Group;

(d) The 2007 triennial review Working Group be given a mandate to modify the methodology, as deemed necessary, to make recommendations on rate changes for that review.

Refinement of current contingent-owned equipment methodology for major equipment

Calculations comparing current and proposed data collection methodologies

Country 1 national cost data

Category/type of equipment	Items listed in national inventory	Current methodology		Proposed methodology				United Nations rate impact	
		National cost total as at 1 January 2000	National cost total as at 31 December 2002	National inventory as at 31 December 2002	National cost per unit as at 31 December 2002	National/ COE manual useful life in years	National use cost per month	Current United Nations dry lease rate	Percentage difference between national cost and United Nations rate
(a)	(b)	(c)	(d)	(e)	(f)=d/e	(g)	(h)=f/g/12	(i)	(j)=((h/i)-1)
ELECTRICAL									
GENERATORS - STATIONARY AND MOBILE									
20KVA to 30KVA	Trailer Fitted Generator 20 KVA	533 025	666 285	15	$44 419	8	$463	$412	12%
31KVA to 40KVA		0	0		$0	12	$0	$308	NA
41KVA to 50KVA		0	0		$0	12	$0	$415	NA
51KVA to 75KVA	Generator 50-60 KVA	74 250	92 810	10	$9 281	12	$64	$492	-87%
151KVA to 200KVA		0	0		$0	15	$0	$598	NA
201KVA to 500KVA		0	0		$0	15	$0	$906	NA
Total Cost of Category: Generators		**$ 607 275**	**$ 759 095**						
Increase/decrease (index) for major equipment category			**25.0%**						**-37%**
ENGINEERING VEHICLES									
Bulldozer, light (D4 & 5)	Wheel Dozer (TLJ 180), D4E, D4C, ZD 3K)	2 129 190	2 765 260	50	$55 305	12	$384	$349	10%
Bulldozer, medium (D6 & 7)	Wheel Dozer Mdl CP 814B, Kos 85a,65E,96D	5 793 550	7 531 670	40	$188 292	15	$1 046	$787	33%
Bulldozer, heavy (D8A)	Wheel Dozer CP Mdl 814F	2 407 600	3 129 880	10	$312 988	20	$1 304	$1 137	15%
Crane, mobile medium (10 to 24 tons)	Crane Medium Workshop (TL-30E)	1 826 700	2 374 710	10	$237 471	15	$1 319	$1 282	3%
Front end loader, light (< 1 cubic meters)	Wheel Loader (ZL 40A + Zettlem. 1700)	65 951	85 739	20	$4 287	12	$30	$409	-93%
Front end loader, medium (1-2 cubic meters)	Wheel Loader (W24c Mdl J1)	927 580	1 205 850	10	$120 585	12	$837	$595	41%
Front end loader, heavy (2-4 cubic meters)	Wheel Loader (AHLMANN AS 200+FLL)	3 247 130	4 221 270	20	$211 064	15	$1 173	$954	23%
Grader, general purpose	Motor Grader (160A, 510,500, 120B)	3 771 144	4 902 480	55	$89 136	20	$371	$562	-34%
Roller, self-propelled	Motorized Mdl XUZHOU,JSTR-4	397 015	516 120	10	$51 612	18	$239	$474	-50%
Roller, towed	Road Roller 6-8 Tandem Type	61 625	80 115	5	$16 023	15	$89	$197	-55%
Snowblower, truck		0	0		$0	12	$0	$1 338	NA
Truck, dump, up to 10 cu meters (civilian pattern)	Truck Dumper up to 8 Tons (5 Types)	1 387 738	1 804 055	55	$32 801	12	$228	$402	-43%
Truck, dump, up to 10 cu meters (military pattern)	Truck Dumper up to 8 Tons (3 Types)	2 726 433	3 544 367	50	$70 887	15	$394	$928	-58%
Excavator (up to1 cubic meter)	Excvtor (Mdl CP Hyd,KAOTHD+ROBIX)	1 803 567	2 344 640	20	$117 232	15	$651	$537	21%
Total Cost of Category: Engineering Vehicles		**$ 26 845 223**	**$ 34 806 156**						
Increase/decrease (index) for major equipment category			**30.0%**						**-14%**

Refinement of current contingent-owned equipment methodology for major equipment

Calculations comparing current and proposed data collection methodologies

Country 2 national cost data

Category/type of equipment	Items listed in national inventory	Current methodology: National cost total as at 1 January 2000	Current methodology: National cost total as at 31 December 2002	Proposed methodology: National inventory as at 31 December 2002	Proposed methodology: National cost per unit as at 31 December 2002	Proposed methodology: National/ COE manual useful life in years	Proposed methodology: National use cost per month	United Nations rate impact: Current United Nations dry lease rate	United Nations rate impact: Percentage difference between national cost and United Nations rate
(a)	(b)	(c)	(d)	(e)	(f)=d/e	(g)	(h)=f/g/12	(i)	(j)=((h/i)-1)
ELECTRICAL									
GENERATORS - STATIONARY AND MOBILE									
20KVA to 30KVA		0	0		$0	8	$0	$412	NA
31KVA to 40KVA		0	0		$0	12	$0	$308	NA
41KVA to 50KVA		0	0		$0	12	$0	$415	NA
51KVA to 75KVA		0	0		$0	2	$0	$492	NA
151KVA to 200KVA		0	0		$0	15	$0	$598	NA
201KVA to 500KVA		0	0		$0	15	$0	$906	NA
Total Cost of Category: Generators		$ -	$ -						
Increase/decrease (index) for major equipment category			**NA**						**NA**
ENGINEERING VEHICLES									
Bulldozer, light (D4 & 5)		0	0		$0	12	$0	$349	NA
Bulldozer, medium (D6 & 7)	Buldozer (D 6 & D 7)	179 057	172 582		$172 582	15	$959	$787	22%
Bulldozer, heavy (D8A)	Buldozer (D 8)	242 648	239 713	1	$239 713	20	$999	$1 137	-12%
Crane, mobile medium (10 to 24 tons)		0	0		$0	15	$0	$1 282	NA
Front end loader, light (< 1 cubic meters)		0	0		$0	12	$0	$409	NA
Front end loader, medium (1-2 cubic meters)		0	0		$0	12	$0	$595	NA
Front end loader, heavy (2-4 cubic meters)		0	0		$0	15	$0	$954	NA
Grader, general purpose	Grader, general purpose	115 738	109 648	1	$109 648	20	$457	$562	-19%
Roller, self-propelled	Roller self propelled	67 541	66 959	1	$66 959	18	$310	$474	-35%
Roller, towed		0	0		$0	15	$0	$197	NA
Snowblower, truck	Snow blower	128 639	128 639	1	$128 639	12	$893	$1 338	-33%
Truck, dump, up to 10 cu meters (civilian pattern)		0	0		$0	12	$0	$402	NA
Truck, dump, up to 10 cu meters (military pattern)		0	0		$0	15	$0	$928	NA
Excavator (up to1 cubic meter)	Excavator (up to 1 cubic)	0	0		$0	15	$0	$537	NA
Total Cost of Category: Engineering Vehicles		$ 733 623	$ 717 541						
Increase/decrease (index) for major equipment category			**-2.2%**						**-15%**

Refinement of current contingent-owned equipment methodology for major equipment

Calculations comparing current and proposed data collection methodologies

Country 3 national cost data

Category/type of equipment	Items listed in national inventory	Current methodology: National cost total as at 1 January 2000	Current methodology: National cost total as at 31 December 2002	Proposed methodology: National inventory as at 31 December 2002	Proposed methodology: National cost per unit as at 31 December 2002	Proposed methodology: National/ COE manual useful life in years	Proposed methodology: National use cost per month	United Nations rate impact: Current United Nations dry lease rate	United Nations rate impact: Percentage difference between national cost and United Nations rate
(a)	(b)	(c)	(d)	(e)	(f)=d/e	(g)	(h)=f/g/12	(i)	(j)=((h/i)-1)
ELECTRICAL									
GENERATORS - STATIONARY AND MOBILE									
20KVA to 30KVA		0	0		0	8	$0	$412	NA
31KVA to 40KVA		0	0		0	12	$0	$308	NA
41KVA to 50KVA		0	0		0	12	$0	$415	NA
51KVA to 75KVA		0	0		0	12	$0	$492	NA
151KVA to 200KVA		0	0		0	15	$0	$598	NA
201KVA to 500KVA		0	0		0	15	$0	$908	NA
Total Cost of Category: Generators		$ -	$ -						
Increase/decrease (index) for major equipment category			NA						NA
ENGINEERING VEHICLES									
Bulldozer, light (D4 & 5)		0	0		0	12	$0	$349	NA
Bulldozer, medium (D6 & 7)		0	0		0	15	$0	$787	NA
Bulldozer, heavy (D8A)		0	0		0	20	$0	$1 137	NA
Crane, mobile medium (10 to 24 tons)		0	0		0	15	$0	$1 282	NA
Front end loader, light (< 1 cubic meters)		0	0		0	12	$0	$409	NA
Front end loader, medium (1-2 cubic meters)		0	0		0	12	$0	$595	NA
Front end loader, heavy (2-4 cubic meters)		0	0		0	15	$0	$954	NA
Grader, general purpose		0	0		0	20	$0	$562	NA
Roller, self-propelled		0	0		0	18	$0	$474	NA
Roller, towed		0	0		0	15	$0	$197	NA
Snowblower, truck		0	0		0	12	$0	$1 338	NA
Truck, dump, up to 10 cu meters (civilian pattern)		0	0		0	12	$0	$402	NA
Truck, dump, up to 10 cu meters (military pattern)		0	0		0	15	$0	$928	NA
Excavator (up to1 cubic meter)		0	0		0	15	$0	$537	NA
Total Cost of Category: Engineering Vehicles		$ -	$ -						
Increase/decrease (index) for major equipment category			NA						NA

Refinement of current contingent-owned equipment methodology for major equipment

Calculations comparing current and proposed data collection methodologies

Country 4 national cost data

		Current methodology		Proposed methodology				United Nations rate impact	
Category/type of equipment	*Items listed in national inventory*	*National cost total as at 1 January 2000*	*National cost total as at 31 December 2002*	*National inventory as at 31 December 2002*	*National cost per unit as at 31 December 2002*	*National/ COE manual useful life in years*	*National use cost per month*	*Current United Nations dry lease rate*	*Percentage difference between national cost and United Nations rate*
(a)	*(b)*	*(c)*	*(d)*	*(e)*	*(f)=d/e*	*(g)*	*(h)=f/g/12*	*(i)*	*(j)=((h/i)-1)*
ELECTRICAL									
GENERATORS - STATIONARY AND MOBILE									
20KVA to 30KVA		0	0		$0	8	$0	$412	NA
31KVA to 40KVA		0	0		$0	12	$0	$308	NA
41KVA to 50KVA		0	0		$0	12	$0	$415	NA
51KVA to 75KVA		101 168	106 696	4	$26 674	12	$185	$492	-62%
151KVA to 200KVA		80 058	84 434	2	$42 217	15	$235	$598	-61%
201KVA to 500KVA		78 364	97 436	2	$48 718	15	$271	$908	-70%
Total Cost of Category: Generators		**$ 259 590**	**$ 288 566**						
Increase/decrease (index) for major equipment category			**11.2%**						**-64%**
ENGINEERING VEHICLES									
Bulldozer, light (D4 & 5)		0	0		$0	12	$0	$349	NA
Bulldozer, medium (D6 & 7)		0	0		$0	15	$0	$787	NA
Bulldozer, heavy (D8A)	Buldozer heavy	665 517	701 898	3	$233 966	20	$975	$1 137	-14%
Crane, mobile medium (10 to 24 tons)		0	0		$0	15	$0	$1 282	NA
Front end loader, light (< 1 cubic meters)		0	0		$0	12	$0	$409	NA
Front end loader, medium (1-2 cubic meters)		0	0		$0	12	$0	$595	NA
Front end loader, heavy (2-4 cubic meters)	Front end load	139 904	147 902	2	$73 951	15	$411	$954	-57%
Grader, general purpose		0	0		$0	20	$0	$562	NA
Roller, self-propelled		0	0		$0	18	$0	$474	NA
Roller, towed		0	0		$0	15	$0	$197	NA
Snowblower, truck		0	0		$0	12	$0	$1 338	NA
Truck, dump, up to 10 cu meters (civilian pattern)		0	0		$0	12	$0	$402	NA
Truck, dump, up to 10 cu meters (military pattern)		0	0		$0	15	$0	$928	NA
Excavator (up to1 cubic meter)	Excavator (up	377 296	311 638	2	$155 819	15	$866	$537	61%
Total Cost of Category: Engineering Vehicles		**$ 1 182 717**	**$ 1 161 438**						
Increase/decrease (index) for major equipment category			**-1.8%**						**-3%**

Refinement of current contingent-owned equipment methodology for major equipment

Calculations comparing current and proposed data collection methodologies

Country 5 national cost data

		Current methodology		Proposed methodology					
								United Nations rate impact	
Category/type of equipment	Items listed in national inventory	National cost total as at 1 January 2000	National cost total as at 31 December 2002	National inventory as at 31 December 2002	National cost per unit is at 31 December 2002	National/ COE manual useful life in years	National use cost per month	Current United Nations dry lease rate	Percentage difference between national cost and United Nations rate
(a)	(b)	(c)	(d)	(e)	(f)=d/e	(g)	(h)=f/g/12	(i)	(j)=((h/i)-1)
ELECTRICAL									
GENERATORS - STATIONARY AND MOBILE									
20KVA to 30KVA	20KVA to 30KVA with cabinets	37 503	43 571	3	$14 524	8	$151	$412	-63%
31KVA to 40KVA	31KVA to 40KVA	27 300	32 500	1	$32 500	12	$226	$308	-27%
41KVA to 50KVA	41KVA to 50KVA +46KVA with cabinets	39 047	47 370	2	$23 685	12	$164	$415	-60%
51KVA to 75KVA	51KVA to 75KVA+70KVA with cabinets	49 195	52 370	2	$26 185	12	$182	$492	-63%
151KVA to 200KVA	151KVA to 200KVA	76 298	85 167	1	$85 167	15	$473	$598	-21%
201KVA to 500KVA	201KVA to 500KVA	141 658	152 862	1	$152 862	15	$849	$906	-7%
Total Cost of Category: Generators		**$ 371 001**	**$ 413 840**						
Increase/decrease (index) for major equipment category			**11.5%**						**-40%**
ENGINEERING VEHICLES									
Bulldozer, light (D4 & 5)		0	0		$0	12	$0	$349	NA
Bulldozer, medium (D6 & 7)	Bulldozer, medium (D6 & 7)	138 420	142 000	1	$142 000	15	$789	$787	0%
Bulldozer, heavy (D8A)	Bulldozer, heavy (D8A)	262 320	280 000	1	$280 000	20	$1 167	$1 137	3%
Crane, mobile medium (10 to 24 tons)	Crane, mobile medium (10 to 24 tons)	228 256	230 000	1	$230 000	15	$1 278	$1 282	0%
Front end loader, light (< 1 cubic meters)		0	0		$0	12	$0	$409	NA
Front end loader, medium (1-2 cubic meters)		0	0		$0	12	$0	$595	NA
Front end loader, heavy (2-4 cubic meters)	Front end loader, heavy (2-4 cu meters)	161 230	175 421	1	$175 421	15	$975	$954	2%
Grader, general purpose	Grader, general purpose	127 560	135 645	1	$135 645	20	$565	$562	1%
Roller, self-propelled	Roller, self-propelled	118 541	125 874	1	$125 874	18	$583	$474	23%
Roller, towed	Roller, towed	32 115	37 521	1	$37 521	15	$208	$197	6%
Snowblower, truck	Snowblower, truck	216 540	235 610	1	$235 610	12	$1 636	$1 338	22%
Truck, dump, up to 10 cu meters (civilian pattern)	Truck, dump, up to 10 cu meters (civilian pattern)	52 147	57 520	1	$57 520	12	$399	$402	-1%
Truck, dump, up to 10 cu meters (military pattern)	Truck, dump, up to 10 cu meters (military pattern)	153 210	165 230	1	$165 230	15	$918	$928	-1%
Excavator (up to1 cubic meter)	Excavator (up to1 cubic meter)	109 650	115 000	1	$115 000	15	$639	$537	19%
Total Cost of Category: Engineering Vehicles		**$ 1 589 989**	**$ 1 699 821**						
Increase/decrease (index) for major equipment category			**6.2%**						**7%**

Refinement of current contingent-owned equipment methodology for major equipment

Calculations comparing current and proposed data collection methodologies

Country 6 national cost data

		Current methodology		Proposed methodology				United Nations rate impact	
Category/type of equipment	*Items listed in national inventory*	*National cost total as at 1 January 2000*	*National cost total as at 31 December 2002*	*National inventory as at 31 December 2002*	*National cost per unit as at 31 December 2002*	*National/ COE manual useful life in years*	*National use cost per month*	*Current United Nations dry lease rate*	*Percentage difference between national cost and United Nations rate*
(a)	*(b)*	*(c)*	*(d)*	*(e)*	*(f)=d/e*	*(g)*	*(h)=f/g/12*	*(i)*	*(j)=((h/i)-1)*
ELECTRICAL									
GENERATORS - STATIONARY AND MOBILE									
20KVA to 30KVA	20KVA to 30KVA	351 000	360 900	9	$40 100	8	$418	$412	1%
31KVA to 40KVA	31KVA to 40KVA	287 000	287 000	7	$41 000	12	$285	$308	-7%
41KVA to 50KVA	41KVA to 50KVA	226 000	233 600	4	$58 400	12	$406	$415	-2%
51KVA to 75KVA	51KVA to 75KVA	471 940	479 500	7	$68 500	12	$476	$492	-3%
151KVA to 200KVA		0	0		$0	15	$0	$598	NA
201KVA to 500KVA		0	0		$0	15	$0	$908	NA
Total Cost of Category: Generators		**$ 1 335 940**	**$ 1 361 000**						
Increase/decrease (index) for major equipment category			**1.9%**						**-3%**
ENGINEERING VEHICLES									
Bulldozer, light (D4 & 5)	Bulldozer, light (D4 & 5)	100 400	102 910	2	$51 455	12	$357	$349	2%
Bulldozer, medium (D6 & 7)		0	0		$0	15	$0	$787	NA
Bulldozer, heavy (D8A)		0	0		$0	20	$0	$1 137	NA
Crane, mobile medium (10 to 24 tons)		0	0		$0	15	$0	$1 282	NA
Front end loader, light (< 1 cubic meters)	Front end loader, light (< 1 cubic meters)	222 400	231 200	4	$57 800	12	$401	$409	-2%
Front end loader, medium (1-2 cubic meters)		0	0		$0	12	$0	$595	NA
Front end loader, heavy (2-4 cubic meters)		0	0		$0	15	$0	$954	NA
Grader, general purpose	Grader, General purpose	241 000	247 026	2	$123 513	20	$515	$562	-8%
Roller, self-propelled	Roller, self-propelled	100 500	103 013	1	$103 013	18	$477	$474	1%
Roller, towed	Roller, towed	71 200	72 980	2	$36 490	15	$203	$197	3%
Snowblower, truck		0	0		$0	12	$0	$1 338	NA
Truck, dump, up to 10 cu meters (civilian pattern)	Truck, dump, up to 10 m3 (civilian pattern)	267 000	275 750	5	$55 150	12	$383	$402	-5%
Truck, dump, up to 10 cu meters (military pattern)		0	0		$0	15	$0	$928	NA
Excavator (up to1 cubic meter)		0	0		$0	15	$0	$537	NA
Total Cost of Category: Engineering Vehicles		**$ 1 002 500**	**$ 1 032 879**						
Increase/decrease (index) for major equipment category			**3.0%**						**-2%**

Refinement of current contingent-owned equipment methodology for major equipment

Calculations comparing current and proposed data collection methodologies

Country 7 national cost data

		Current methodology		Proposed methodology					
								United Nations rate impact	
Category/type of equipment	Items listed in national inventory	National cost total as at 1 January 2000	National cost total as at 31 December 2002	National inventory as at 31 December 2002	National cost per unit as at 31 December 2002	National/ COE manual useful life in years	National use cost per month	Current United Nations dry lease rate	Percentage difference between national cost and United Nations rate
(a)	(b)	(c)	(d)	(e)	(f)=d/e	(g)	(h)=f/g/12	(i)	(j)=((h/i)-1)
ELECTRICAL									
GENERATORS - STATIONARY AND MOBILE									
20KVA to 30KVA		0	0		$0	8	$0	$412	NA
31KVA to 40KVA	31KVA to 40KVA	108 000	109 836	6	$18 306	12	$127	$308	-59%
41KVA to 50KVA		0	0		$0	12	$0	$415	NA
51KVA to 75KVA		0	0		$0	12	$0	$492	NA
151KVA to 200KVA		0	0		$0	15	$0	$598	NA
201KVA to 500KVA		0	0		$0	15	$0	$908	NA
Total Cost of Category: Generators		$ 108 000	$ 109 836						
Increase/decrease (index) for major equipment category			1.7%						-59%
ENGINEERING VEHICLES									
Bulldozer, light (D4 & 5)		0	0		$0	12	$0	$349	NA
Bulldozer, medium (D6 & 7)		0	0		$0	15	$0	$787	NA
Bulldozer, heavy (D8A)		0	0		$0	20	$0	$1 137	NA
Crane, mobile medium (10 to 24 tone)		0	0		$0	15	$0	$1 282	NA
Front end loader, light (< 1 cubic meters)		0	0		$0	12	$0	$409	NA
Front end loader, medium (1-2 cubic meters)		0	0		$0	12	$0	$595	NA
Front end loader, heavy (2-4 cubic meters)		0	0		$0	15	$0	$954	NA
Grader, general purpose		0	0		$0	20	$0	$562	NA
Roller, self-propelled		0	0		$0	18	$0	$474	NA
Roller, towed		0	0		$0	15	$0	$197	NA
Snowblower, truck		0	0		$0	12	$0	$1 338	NA
Truck, dump, up to 10 cu meters (civilian pattern)		0	0		$0	12	$0	$402	NA
Truck, dump, up to 10 cu meters (military pattern)		0	0		$0	15	$0	$928	NA
Excavator (up to1 cubic meter)		0	0		$0	15	$0	$537	NA
Total Cost of Category: Engineering Vehicles		$ -	$ -						
Increase/decrease (index) for major equipment category			NA						NA

Refinement of current contingent-owned equipment methodology for major equipment

Calculations comparing current and proposed data collection methodologies

Country 8 national cost data

		Current methodology		Proposed methodology					
								United Nations rate impact	
Category/type of equipment	*Items listed in national inventory*	*National cost total as at 1 January 2000*	*National cost total as at 31 December 2002*	*National inventory as at 31 December 2002*	*National cost per unit as at 31 December 2002*	*National/ COE manual useful life in years*	*National use cost per month*	*Current United Nations dry lease rate*	*Percentage difference between national cost and United Nations rate*
(a)	*(b)*	*(c)*	*(d)*	*(e)*	*(f)=d/e*	*(g)*	*(h)=f/g/12*	*(i)*	*(j)=((h/i)-1)*
ELECTRICAL									
GENERATORS - STATIONARY AND MOBILE									
20KVA to 30KVA	**20KVA to 30KVA**	31 500	$ 31 500	1	$31 500	8	$328	$412	-20%
31KVA to 40KVA	31KVA to 40KVA	35 420	$ 35 420	1	$35 420	12	$246	$308	-20%
41KVA to 50KVA	41KVA to 50KVA	43 230	$ 43 230	1	$43 230	12	$300	$415	-28%
51KVA to 75KVA	51KVA to 75KVA	61 000	$ 61 000	1	$61 000	12	$424	$492	-14%
151KVA to 200KVA		0			$0	15	$0	$598	NA
201KVA to 500KVA		0			$0	15	$0	$908	NA
Total Cost of Category: Generators		**$ 171 150**	**171 150**						
Increase/decrease (index) for major equipment category			**0.0%**						**-20%**
ENGINEERING VEHICLES									
Bulldozer, light (D4 & 5)		0			$0	12	$0	$349	NA
Bulldozer, medium (D6 & 7)		0			$0	15	$0	$787	NA
Bulldozer, heavy (D8A)		0			$0	20	$0	$1 137	NA
Crane, mobile medium (10 to 24 tons)		0			$0	15	$0	$1 282	NA
Front end loader, light (< 1 cubic meters)		0			$0	12	$0	$409	NA
Front end loader, medium (1-2 cubic meters)	Wheel Loader 996 F-2	125 000	$ 125 000	1	$125 000	15	$694	$595	17%
Front end loader, heavy (2-4 cubic meters)		0			$0	15	$0	$954	NA
Grader, general purpose	Grader Komatsu (GD705A-4)	157 200	$ 157 200	1	$157 200	15	$873	$562	55%
Roller, self-propelled		0			$0	18	$0	$474	NA
Roller, towed		0			$0	15	$0	$197	NA
Snowblower, truck		0			$0	12	$0	$1 338	NA
Truck, dump, up to 10 cu meters (civilian pattern)		0			$0	12	$0	$402	NA
Truck, dump, up to 10 cu meters (military pattern)		0			$0	15	$0	$928	NA
Excavator (up to1 cubic meter)		0			$0	15	$0	$537	NA
Total Cost of Category: Engineering Vehicles		**$ 282 200**	**28 200**						
Increase/decrease (index) for major equipment category			**0.0%**						**36%**

Refinement of current contingent-owned equipment methodology for major equipment

Calculations comparing current and proposed data collection methodologies

Country 9 national cost data

Category/type of equipment	Items listed in national inventory	Current methodology		Proposed methodology				United Nations rate impact	
		National cost total as at 1 January 2000	National cost total as at 31 December 2002	National inventory as at 31 December 2002	National cost per unit as at 31 December 2002	National/ COE manual useful life in years	National use cost per month	Current United Nations dry lease rate	Percentage difference between national cost and United Nations rate
(a)	(b)	(c)	(d)	(e)	(f)=d/e	(g)	(h)=f/g/12	(i)	(j)=((h/i)-1)
ELECTRICAL									
GENERATORS - STATIONARY AND MOBILE									
20KVA to 30KVA		0	0		$0	8	$0	$412	NA
31KVA to 40KVA		0	0		$0	12	$0	$308	NA
41KVA to 50KVA		0	0		$0	12	$0	$415	NA
51KVA to 75KVA		0	0		$0	12	$0	$492	NA
151KVA to 200KVA	Gas Generating System	10 239 341	6 336 801	95	$66 703	15	$371	$598	-38%
201KVA to 500KVA	Generators Sets	174 658 776	126 705 825	904	140 161	15	779	908	-14%
Total Cost of Category: Generators		**$ 184 898 117**	**$ 133 042 626**						
Increase/decrease (index) for major equipment category			**-28.0%**						**-26%**
ENGINEERING VEHICLES									
Bulldozer, light (D4 & 5)	APC A2 Bulldozer/EFT PROV PEE	565 002	565 002	18	$31 389	12	$218	$349	-38%
Bulldozer, medium (D6 & 7)		0	0		$0	15	$0	$787	NA
Bulldozer, heavy (D8A)		0	0		$0	20	$0	$1 137	NA
Crane, mobile medium (10 to 24 tons)	Grader, special purpose 5 types	7 976 909	8 133 462	28	$290 481	15	$1 614	$1 282	26%
Front end loader, light (< 1 cubic meters)	Front end loader, light (< 1 cubic meters) 14 types	4 098 718	3 783 057	81	$46 704	12	$324	$409	-21%
Front end loader, medium (1-2 cubic meters)	Front end loader, medium(1-2 m3) 8 types	5 766 077	5 383 519	57	$94 448	15	$525	$595	-12%
Front end loader, heavy (2-4 cubic meters)		0	0		$0	15	$0	$954	NA
Grader, general purpose	Grader, general purpose 9 types	9 571 999	9 932 286	75	$132 430	15	$736	$562	31%
Roller, self-propelled		0	0		$0	18	$0	$474	NA
Roller, towed		0	0		$0	15	$0	$197	NA
Snowblower, truck	Snowblower, truck 2 types	18 675 877	21 025 065	69	$304 711	12	$2 116	$1 338	58%
Truck, dump, up to 10 cu meters (civilian pattern)		0	0		$0	12	$0	$402	NA
Truck, dump, up to 10 cu meters (military pattern)	Truck, up to 10 m3 (military pattern) 14 types	29 280 440	27 059 182	170	$159 172	15	$884	$928	-5%
Excavator (up to1 cubic meter)	Excavator (up to 1 m3) 5 types	883 921	449 426	6	74 904	15	416	537	-22%
Total Cost of Category: Engineering Vehicles		**$ 76 818 943**	**$ 76 331 000**						
Increase/decrease (index) for major equipment category			**-0.6%**						**2%**

Refinement of current contingent-owned equipment methodology for major equipment

Calculations comparing current and proposed data collection methodologies

using national cost data submitted by nine Member States

Category/type of equipment	Current methodology		Proposed methodology									
	Member State average Percentage change	Current United Nations monthly dry lease rate	Percentage difference between national cost and United Nations rate	Proposed United Nations monthly dry lease rate	Quantity data	Factor data	Handicap category	Sum input	Average (handicap)	Standard deviation	Max value	Min value
(a)	(b)	(c)	(d)	(e)	(f)	(g)	(h)	(i)	(j)	(k)	(l)	(m)
ELECTRICAL												
GENERATORS - STATIONARY AND MOBILE												
20KVA to 30KVA		$412	-17%	$ 340	4	100.00%	67%	-70%	-12%	33%	12%	-63%
31KVA to 40KVA		$308	-28%	$ 221	4	100.00%	67%	-113%	-19%	22%	-7%	-59%
41KVA to 50KVA		$415	-30%	$ 290	3	100.00%	50%	-90%	-15%	29%	-2%	-60%
51KVA to 75KVA		$492	-46%	$ 266	5	100.00%	83%	-230%	-38%	36%	-3%	-87%
151KVA to 200KVA		$598	-40%	$ 359	3	100.00%	50%	-120%	-20%	20%	-21%	-61%
201KVA to 500KVA		908	-30%	$ 633	3	100.00%	50%	-91%	-15%	35%	-7%	-70%
Total Cost of Category: Generators												
Increase/decrease (index) for major equipment category	3%		-32%									
ENGINEERING VEHICLES												
Bulldozer, light (D4 & 5)		$349	-8%	$ 320	3	100.00%	50%	-25%	-4%	26%	10%	-38%
Bulldozer, medium (D6 & 7)		$787	18%	$ 931	3	100.00%	50%	55%	9%	17%	33%	0%
Bulldozer, heavy (D8A)		$1 137	-2%	$ 1 111	4	100.00%	67%	-9%	-2%	14%	15%	-14%
Crane, mobile medium (10 to 24 tons)		$1 282	9%	$ 1 404	3	100.00%	50%	28%	5%	14%	26%	0%
Front end loader, light (< 1 cubic meters)		$409	-38%	$ 252	3	100.00%	50%	-115%	-19%	48%	-2%	-93%
Front end loader, medium (1-2 cubic meters)		$595	15%	$ 686	3	100.00%	50%	46%	8%	26%	41%	-12%
Front end loader, heavy (2-4 cubic meters)		$954	11%	$ 853	3	100.00%	50%	-32%	-5%	41%	23%	-57%
Grader, general purpose		$562	4%	$ 586	6	100.00%	100%	26%	4%	33%	55%	-34%
Roller, self-propelled		$474	-15%	$ 402	4	100.00%	67%	-60%	-10%	33%	23%	-50%
Roller, towed		$197	-15%	$ 167	3	100.00%	50%	-48%	-8%	34%	6%	-55%
Snowblower, truck		$1 338	16%	$ 1 549	3	100.00%	50%	47%	8%	46%	58%	-33%
Truck, dump, up to 10 cu meters (civilian pattern)		$402	-16%	$ 337	3	100.00%	50%	-49%	-8%	24%	-1%	-43%
Truck, dump, up to 10 cu meters (military pattern)		$928	-21%	$ 732	3	100.00%	50%	-63%	-11%	32%	-1%	-58%
Excavator (up to1 cubic meter)		537	20%	$ 643	4	100.00%	67%	79%	13%	34%	61%	-22%
Total Cost of Category: Engineering Vehicles												
Increase/decrease (index) for major equipment category	5%		-3%		6							

Annex II.A.1

Triennial review of the reimbursement rates for self-sustainment

Background

1. In 2001, the post-Phase V Working Group on reform procedures for determining reimbursement of contingent-owned equipment developed a new methodology for calculating reimbursement rates for self-sustainment and major equipment. The new methodology was accepted by the General Assembly in April 2003 (see A/57/774). It was recommended by the post-Phase V Working Group that there should be a triennial review of the reimbursement rates, based on data submitted by Member States. In May 2003, the Secretariat sent questionnaires to Member States for the purpose of collecting data for recalculation of the rates for major equipment and self-sustainment in the beginning of 2004. Data for self-sustainment was received from 24 Member States.

2. The existing rates were calculated in January 2001 and approved by the General Assembly in 2001.

Discussion

3. It was decided by the 2004 Working Group on Contingent-Owned Equipment that the self-sustainment rates for the medical category would be determined by the Sub-Working Group on medical support services.

4. The statistical method of calculation of new rates is, in principle, based on the comparison of national data from one period with national data of another period. A discussion started on whether these data should be linked to the value of the existing reimbursement rates. Investigation showed that the present data did not allow the Working Group to make such a connection. On the basis of the statistical methodology, as developed in 2001, the Working Group calculated five alternative new rates for self-sustainment. The first alternative was based on a no-cut factor; the other calculations were based on respectively a cut 20, a cut 15, a cut 10 and a cut 6 factor. The "cut 6 factor" was the lowest factor with which the statistic model operated properly.

5. After intensive discussion, it became clear that a number of Member States had lost faith in the results of running the statistic model and therefore no consensus over the thus calculated new rates could be reached. In particular, those Member States had reservations about the data used as input for the statistical model. This was the reason for one Member State submitting a new model for calculation of self-sustainment rates.

6. Other Member States insisted on applying the statistical model to adjust the rates. Therefore no consensus could be reached in the Working Group. The Chairperson asked representatives of both groups of Member States to write statements in which their views were explained (see annexes II.A.2 and II.A.3).

Collecting data

7. It was agreed at the 2004 Working Group that, in future, the United Nations Secretariat should take action to make it clear to all countries submitting data to the

2007 Working Group, that there were three distinct positions that could be adopted, namely:

(a) Inputting numeric data;

(b) Inputting a zero figure, thus indicating that a country was content to reflect no increase in the cost of its equipment;

(c) Inputting no data at all, which would be interpreted as "N/A" in the statistical model and would thus have no bearing on the final outcome.

8. It was important that countries be made aware of the difference between a zero input and the non-input of any data, in particular, that a zero input had a value in a statistical model (and thus affected the statistical output), whereas no input would have no effect on the model and thus would have no statistical output in the model.

Recommendations

9. At the moment that the Secretariat sends questionnaires to Member States for the purpose of collecting data, the Secretariat should make clear what impact this data will have on future calculations of self-sustainment rates.

Annexes

Annex II.A.2. Views of a group of Member States on applying the statistical methodology for calculating new rates for self- sustainment.

Annex II.A.3. Views of another group of Member States on not applying the statistical methodology for calculating new rates for self- sustainment.

Statistical model calculations

No cut

Categories	*Current*	Argentina	Austria	Bangladesh	Brazil	Burkina Faso	Canada	China	Denmark	France	India	Italy	Japan	Jordan
Catering	***26.33***	2.44%	-15.06%	30.00%	1.00%	n/a	10.45%	2.00%	6.22%	2.00%	29.00%	2.85%	1.00%	5.63%
Communications - VHF/UHF-FM	***48.48***	6.11%	-22.17%	30.00%	1.50%	10.00%	-11.65%	2.00%	6.22%	2.00%	26.00%	5.41%	-2.00%	7.52%
Communications - HF	***16.95***	6.11%	0.00%	30.00%	4.00%	n/a	-33.89%	2.00%	6.22%	2.00%	n/a	1.81%	-2.00%	7.52%
Communications - Telephone	***14.07***	6.11%	-5.46%	30.00%	2.50%	n/a	8.32%	2.00%	6.22%	2.00%	n/a	1.54%	-2.00%	7.52%
Office	***22.72***	2.44%	n/a	30.00%	1.50%	2.00%	-5.92%	2.00%	6.22%	2.00%	27.00%	2.52%	4.40%	8.72%
Electrical	***27.85***	0.64%	-33.05%	30.00%	4.00%	n/a	0.00%	2.00%	6.22%	2.00%	27.00%	2.97%	n/a	6.80%
Minor Engineering	***15.95***	2.44%	8.37%	30.00%	5.00%	n/a	0.00%	2.00%	6.22%	2.00%	27.00%	1.66%	n/a	5.57%
Explosive Ordnance Disposal (EOD)	***7.27***	2.44%	-0.70%	30.00%	4.00%	n/a	0.00%	2.00%	6.22%	2.00%	29.00%	0.77%	n/a	2.64%
Laundry and cleaning	***22.05***	2.44%	-44.42%	30.00%	0.00%	n/a	13.11%	2.00%	6.22%	2.00%	27.00%	2.98%	n/a	7.85%
Tentage	***22.60***	2.44%	0.00%	23.00%	4.00%	n/a	0.00%	2.00%	6.22%	2.00%	27.00%	2.38%	7.00%	8.69%
Accommodation	***38.52***	2.44%	20.99%	n/a	2.00%	n/a	-22.95%	2.00%	6.22%	2.00%	n/a	4.28%	n/a	8.69%
Observation - General	***1.07***	6.11%	n/a	30.00%	2.00%	n/a	0.00%	2.00%	6.22%	2.00%	25.00%	1.19%	-25.20%	4.42%
Observation - Night Observation	***23.95***	6.11%	21.88%	30.00%	0.00%	n/a	-3.75%	2.00%	6.22%	2.00%	n/a	2.76%	-25.20%	4.42%
Observation - Positioning	***5.45***	6.11%	4.25%	30.00%	3.00%	n/a	0.00%	2.00%	6.22%	2.00%	n/a	0.59%	-25.20%	4.42%
Identification	***1.06***	6.11%	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	-8.00%	n/a	6.22%	2.00%	23.00%	1.20%	n/a	7.69%
NBCP	***25.59***	6.11%	-12.97%	n/a	1.00%	n/a	-14.95%	n/a	6.22%	2.00%	n/a	2.88%	-4.70%	8.89%
Base defence store	***33.62***	6.11%	n/a	n/a	4.00%	n/a	20.33%	2.00%	6.22%	2.00%	23.00%	3.59%	9.30%	7.53%
Miscellaneous - Bedding	***15.13***	2.44%	-13.73%	30.00%	3.00%	n/a	0.00%	2.00%	6.22%	2.00%	28.00%	1.66%	6.00%	8.24%
Miscellaneous - Furniture	***22.03***	2.44%	0.00%	30.00%	0.00%	n/a	0.00%	2.00%	6.22%	2.00%	28.00%	2.78%	6.00%	7.25%
Miscellaneous - Welfare	***6.01***	2.44%	9.12%	30.00%	0.00%	0.50%	-3.70%	2.00%	6.22%	2.00%	28.00%	0.59%	6.00%	8.32%
Total	***398.70***													

Statistical model calculations

No cut

Categories	Pakistan	Poland	Russia	Sweden	Thailand	Tunisia	Turkey	Ukraine	Uruguay	Zambia	Zimbabwe	No	Average
Catering	20.00%	3.68%	29.00%	6.40%	7.21%	14.00%	n/a	15.00%	19.68%	20.40%	11.69%	22	***10.21%***
Communications - VHF/UHF-FM	20.00%	n/a	27.00%	4.60%	8.60%	28.24%	0.02%	n/a	4.37%	9.00%	0.30%	22	***7.41%***
Communications - HF	20.00%	n/a	27.00%	4.60%	10.44%	28.24%	n/a	n/a	6.89%	9.00%	11.69%	19	***7.45%***
Communications - Telephone	20.00%	6.71%	27.00%	4.60%	8.60%	28.24%	n/a	n/a	4.50%	9.00%	11.69%	20	***8.95%***
Office	20.00%	n/a	19.00%	4.60%	2.89%	n/a	n/a	n/a	2.27%	61.00%	11.69%	19	***10.75%***
Electrical	20.00%	n/a	28.00%	4.60%	17.29%	n/a	n/a	n/a	9.21%	6.00%	11.69%	18	***8.08%***
Minor Engineering	20.00%	n/a	37.00%	4.60%	2.89%	n/a	n/a	n/a	26.90%	10.00%	11.69%	18	***11.30%***
Explosive Ordnance Disposal (EOD)	n/a	n/a	37.00%	4.60%	8.60%	n/a	n/a	n/a	12.45%	1.00%	11.69%	17	***9.04%***
Laundry and cleaning	20.00%	3.83%	26.00%	6.40%	12.08%	14.08%	n/a	n/a	15.27%	1.00%	11.69%	20	***7.98%***
Tentage	20.00%	n/a	30.00%	4.60%	8.60%	n/a	n/a	0.00%	1.57%	41.00%	15.00%	20	***10.28%***
Accommodation	20.00%	n/a	34.00%	6.40%	8.60%	n/a	n/a	n/a	10.06%	0.00%	11.69%	16	***7.28%***
Observation - General	20.00%	n/a	69.00%	4.60%	8.60%	18.62%	n/a	n/a	3.53%	67.00%	11.69%	19	***13.51%***
Observation - Night Observation	20.00%	n/a	69.00%	4.60%	8.60%	18.62%	n/a	n/a	10.57%	67.00%	11.69%	19	***13.50%***
Observation - Positioning	20.00%	n/a	69.00%	4.60%	8.60%	18.62%	n/a	n/a	2.70%	67.00%	11.69%	19	***12.40%***
Identification	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	7	***5.46%***
NBCP	n/a	1.47%	42.00%	4.60%	n/a	n/a	0.02%	n/a	-0.33%	0.00%	n/a	15	***2.82%***
Base defence store	n/a	n/a	17.00%	4.60%	8.60%	n/a	n/a	n/a	18.34%	0.00%	15.00%	16	***9.23%***
Miscellaneous - Bedding	20.00%	n/a	31.00%	6.40%	8.60%	9.00%	0.37%	n/a	26.67%	-30.00%	15.00%	21	***7.76%***
Miscellaneous - Furniture	20.00%	n/a	34.00%	6.40%	8.60%	9.00%	0.37%	n/a	13.87%	-30.00%	15.00%	21	***7.81%***
Miscellaneous - Welfare	20.00%	n/a	45.00%	6.40%	8.60%	9.00%	0.37%	n/a	24.41%	-30.00%	15.00%	22	***8.65%***
												22	

Statistical model calculations

No cut

Categories	Current Rates	QTY DATA	Factor data	Handicap	Sum of input values	Average with handicap	ST-DEV	MAX	MIN	VARIANCE		NEW RATES	INCREASE
Catering	***26.33***	22	100.00%	100.00%	2.25	**10.21%**	**11.10%**	30.00%	-15.06%	0.01232		***29.02***	***10.21%***
Communications - VHF/UHF-FM	***48.48***	22	100.00%	100.00%	1.63	**7.41%**	**12.71%**	30.00%	-22.17%	0.01615		***52.07***	***7.41%***
Communications - HF	***16.95***	19	100.00%	86.36%	1.42	**6.44%**	**13.90%**	30.00%	-33.89%	0.01932		***18.04***	***6.44%***
Communications - Telephone	***14.07***	20	100.00%	90.91%	1.79	**8.14%**	**9.88%**	30.00%	-5.46%	0.00975		***15.22***	***8.14%***
Office	***22.72***	19	100.00%	86.36%	2.04	**9.29%**	**15.42%**	61.00%	-5.92%	0.02378		***24.83***	***9.29%***
Electrical	***27.85***	18	100.00%	81.82%	1.45	**6.61%**	**14.20%**	30.00%	-33.05%	0.02016		***29.69***	***6.61%***
Minor Engineering	***15.95***	18	100.00%	81.82%	2.03	**9.24%**	**11.56%**	37.00%	0.00%	0.01337		***17.42***	***9.24%***
Explosive Ordnance Disposal (EOD)	***7.27***	17	100.00%	77.27%	1.54	**6.99%**	**11.69%**	37.00%	-0.70%	0.01365		***7.78***	***6.99%***
Laundry and cleaning	***22.05***	20	100.00%	90.91%	1.60	**7.25%**	**15.34%**	30.00%	-44.42%	0.02353		***23.65***	***7.25%***
Tentage	***22.60***	20	100.00%	90.91%	2.06	**9.34%**	**11.81%**	41.00%	0.00%	0.01394		***24.71***	***9.34%***
Accommodation	***38.52***	16	100.00%	72.73%	1.16	**5.29%**	**12.05%**	34.00%	-22.95%	0.01453		***40.56***	***5.29%***
Observation - General	***1.07***	19	100.00%	86.36%	2.57	**11.67%**	**22.41%**	69.00%	-25.20%	0.05022		***1.19***	***11.67%***
Observation - Night Observation	***23.95***	19	100.00%	86.36%	2.57	**11.66%**	**22.38%**	69.00%	-25.20%	0.05009		***26.74***	***11.66%***
Observation - Positioning	***5.45***	19	100.00%	86.36%	2.36	**10.71%**	**22.34%**	69.00%	-25.20%	0.04989		***6.03***	***10.71%***
Identification	***1.06***	7	100.00%	31.82%	0.38	**1.74%**	**9.35%**	23.00%	-8.00%	0.00875		***1.08***	***1.74%***
NBCP	***25.59***	15	100.00%	68.18%	0.42	**1.92%**	**12.68%**	42.00%	-14.95%	0.01608		***26.08***	***1.92%***
Base defence store	***33.62***	16	100.00%	72.73%	1.48	**6.71%**	**7.22%**	23.00%	0.00%	0.00521		***35.88***	***6.71%***
Miscellaneous - Bedding	***15.13***	21	100.00%	95.45%	1.63	**7.40%**	**14.44%**	31.00%	-30.00%	0.02085		***16.25***	***7.40%***
Miscellaneous - Furniture	***22.03***	21	100.00%	95.45%	1.64	**7.45%**	**13.46%**	34.00%	-30.00%	0.01811		***23.67***	***7.45%***
Miscellaneous - Welfare	***6.01***	22	100.00%	100.00%	1.90	**8.65%**	**14.86%**	45.00%	-30.00%	0.02207		***6.53***	***8.65%***
Total	***396.70***											***426.45***	***7.50%***

Statistical model calculations

No cut

Impact on UN budget

Categories	% of total UN budget	Weighted average	
Catering	7.88%	0.80%	
Communications - VHF/UHF-FM	6.54%	0.48%	=19.62% / 3
Communications - HF	6.54%	0.42%	=19.62% / 3
Communications - Telephone	6.54%	0.53%	=19.62% / 3
Office	6.17%	0.57%	
Electrical	6.23%	0.41%	
Minor Engineering	4.42%	0.41%	
Explosive Ordnance Disposal (EOD)	2.17%	0.15%	
Laundry and cleaning	6.86%	0.50%	
Tentage	5.28%	0.49%	
Accommodation	1.84%	0.10%	
Observation - General	2.90%	0.34%	=8.7% / 3
Observation - Night Observation	2.90%	0.34%	=8.7% / 3
Observation - Positioning	2.90%	0.31%	=8.7% / 3
Identification	0.00%	0.00%	
NBCP	0.00%	0.00%	
Base defence store	1.64%	0.11%	
Miscellaneous - Bedding	4.41%	0.33%	=13.24% / 3
Miscellaneous - Furniture	4.41%	0.33%	=13.24% / 3
Miscellaneous - Welfare	4.41%	0.38%	=13.24% / 3
	84.04%	**7.01%**	

NEW WEIGHTED AVERAGE		
% of total UN budget	New weighted average	
7.88%	9.38%	0.96%
6.54%	7.78%	0.58%
6.54%	7.78%	0.50%
6.54%	7.78%	0.63%
6.17%	7.34%	0.68%
6.23%	7.41%	0.49%
4.42%	5.26%	0.49%
2.17%	2.58%	0.18%
6.86%	8.16%	0.59%
5.28%	6.28%	0.59%
1.84%	2.19%	0.12%
2.90%	3.45%	0.40%
2.90%	3.45%	0.40%
2.90%	3.45%	0.37%
0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
1.64%	1.95%	0.13%
4.41%	5.25%	0.39%
4.41%	5.25%	0.39%
4.41%	5.25%	0.45%
84.05%	100.00%	**8.34%**

Statistical model calculations

Cut 20

Categories	*Current*	Argentina	Austria	Bangladesh	Brazil	Burkina Faso	Canada	China	Denmark	France	India	Italy	Japan	Jordan
Catering	***26.33***	2.44%	-15.06%	30.00%	1.00%	n/a	10.45%	2.00%	6.22%	2.00%	29.00%	2.85%	1.00%	5.63%
Communications - VHF/UHF-FM	***48.48***	6.11%	-22.17%	30.00%	1.50%	10.00%	-11.65%	2.00%	6.22%	2.00%	26.00%	5.41%	-2.00%	7.52%
Communications - HF	***16.95***	6.11%	0.00%	30.00%	4.00%	n/a	-33.89%	2.00%	6.22%	2.00%	n/a	1.81%	-2.00%	7.52%
Communications - Telephone	***14.07***	6.11%	-5.46%	30.00%	2.50%	n/a	8.32%	2.00%	6.22%	2.00%	n/a	1.54%	-2.00%	7.52%
Office	***22.72***	2.44%	n/a	30.00%	1.50%	2.00%	5.92%	2.00%	6.22%	2.00%	27.00%	2.52%	4.40%	8.72%
Electrical	***27.85***	0.64%	-33.05%	30.00%	4.00%	n/a	0.00%	2.00%	6.22%	2.00%	27.00%	2.97%	n/a	6.80%
Minor Engineering	***15.95***	2.44%	8.37%	30.00%	5.00%	n/a	0.00%	2.00%	6.22%	2.00%	27.00%	1.66%	n/a	5.57%
Explosive Ordnance Disposal (EOD)	***7.27***	2.44%	-0.70%	30.00%	4.00%	n/a	0.00%	2.00%	6.22%	2.00%	29.00%	0.77%	n/a	2.64%
Laundry and cleaning	***22.05***	2.44%	-44.42%	30.00%	0.00%	n/a	13.11%	2.00%	6.22%	2.00%	27.00%	2.98%	n/a	7.85%
Tentage	***22.60***	2.44%	0.00%	23.00%	4.00%	n/a	0.00%	2.00%	6.22%	2.00%	27.00%	2.38%	7.00%	8.69%
Accommodation	***38.52***	2.44%	20.99%	n/a	2.00%	n/a	-22.95%	2.00%	6.22%	2.00%	n/a	4.28%	n/a	8.69%
Observation - General	***1.07***	6.11%	n/a	30.00%	2.00%	n/a	0.00%	2.00%	6.22%	2.00%	25.00%	1.19%		4.42%
Observation - Night Observation	***23.95***	6.11%	21.88%	30.00%	0.00%	n/a	-3.75%	2.00%	6.22%	2.00%	n/a	2.76%		4.42%
Observation - Positioning	***5.45***	6.11%	4.25%	30.00%	3.00%	n/a	0.00%	2.00%	6.22%	2.00%	n/a	0.59%		4.42%
Identification	***1.06***	6.11%	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	-8.00%	n/a	6.22%	2.00%	23.00%	1.20%	n/a	7.69%
NBCP	***25.59***	6.11%	-12.97%	n/a	1.00%	n/a	-14.95%	n/a	6.22%	2.00%	n/a	2.88%	-4.70%	8.89%
Base defence store	***33.62***	6.11%	n/a	n/a	4.00%	n/a	20.33%	2.00%	6.22%	2.00%	23.00%	3.59%	9.30%	7.53%
Miscellaneous - Bedding	***15.13***	2.44%	-13.73%	30.00%	3.00%	n/a	0.00%	2.00%	6.22%	2.00%	28.00%	1.66%	6.00%	8.24%
Miscellaneous - Furniture	***22.03***	2.44%	0.00%	30.00%	0.00%	n/a	0.00%	2.00%	6.22%	2.00%	28.00%	2.78%	6.00%	7.25%
Miscellaneous - Welfare	***6.01***	2.44%	9.12%	30.00%	0.00%	0.50%	-3.70%	2.00%	6.22%	2.00%	28.00%	0.59%	6.00%	8.32%
Total	***396.70***													

Statistical model calculations

Cut 20

Categories	Pakistan	Poland	Russia	Sweden	Thailand	Tunisia	Turkey	Ukraine	Uruguay	Zambia	Zimbabwe	No	Average
Catering	20.00%	3.68%	29.00%	6.40%	7.21%	14.00%	n/a	15.00%	19.68%	20.40%	11.69%	22	***10.21%***
Communications - VHF/UHF-FM	20.00%	n/a	27.00%	4.60%	8.60%	28.24%	0.02%	n/a	4.37%	9.00%	0.30%	2	***7.41%***
Communications - HF	20.00%	n/a	27.00%	4.60%	10.44%	28.24%	n/a	n/a	6.89%	9.00%	11.69%	19	***7.45%***
Communications - Telephone	20.00%	6.71%	27.00%	4.60%	8.60%	28.24%	n/a	n/a	4.50%	9.00%	11.69%	20	***8.95%***
Office	20.00%	n/a	19.00%	4.60%	2.89%	n/a	n/a	n/a	2.27%	61.00%	11.69%	19	***10.75%***
Electrical	20.00%	n/a	28.00%	4.60%	17.29%	n/a	n/a	n/a	9.21%	6.00%	11.69%	18	***8.08%***
Minor Engineering	20.00%	n/a	37.00%	4.60%	2.89%	n/a	n/a	n/a	26.90%	10.00%	11.69%	18	***11.30%***
Explosive Ordnance Disposal (EOD)	n/a	n/a	37.00%	4.60%	8.60%	n/a	n/a	n/a	12.45%	1.00%	11.69%	17	***9.04%***
Laundry and cleaning	20.00%	3.83%	26.00%	6.40%	12.08%	14.08%	n/a	n/a	15.27%	1.00%	11.69%	20	***7.98%***
Tentage	20.00%	n/a	30.00%	4.60%	8.60%	n/a	n/a	0.00%	1.57%	41.00%	15.00%	20	***10.28%***
Accommodation	20.00%	n/a	34.00%	6.40%	8.60%	n/a	n/a	n/a	10.06%	0.00%	11.69%	16	***7.28%***
Observation - General	20.00%	n/a		4.60%	8.60%	18.62%	n/a	n/a	3.53%		11.69%	16	***9.12%***
Observation - Night Observation	20.00%	n/a		4.60%	8.60%	18.62%	n/a	n/a	10.57%		11.69%	16	***9.11%***
Observation - Positioning	20.00%	n/a		4.60%	8.60%	18.62%	n/a	n/a	2.70%		11.69%	16	***7.80%***
Identification	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	7	***5.46%***
NBCP	n/a	1.47%	42.00%	4.60%	n/a	n/a	0.02%	n/a	-0.33%	0.00%	n/a	15	***2.82%***
Base defence store	n/a	n/a	17.00%	4.60%	8.60%	n/a	n/a	n/a	18.34%	0.00%	15.00%	16	***9.23%***
Miscellaneous - Bedding	20.00%	n/a	31.00%	6.40%	8.60%	9.00%	0.37%	n/a	26.67%	-30.00%	15.00%	21	***7.76%***
Miscellaneous - Furniture	20.00%	n/a	34.00%	6.40%	8.60%	9.00%	0.37%	n/a	13.87%	-30.00%	15.00%	21	***7.81%***
Miscellaneous - Welfare	20.00%	n/a	45.00%	6.40%	8.60%	9.00%	0.37%	n/a	24.41%	-30.00%	15.00%	22	***8.65%***
												22	

Statistical model calculations

Cut 20

Categories	Current Rates	QTY DATA	Factor data	Handicap	Sum of input values	Average with handicap	ST-DEV	MAX	MIN	VARIANCE		NEW RATES	INCREASE
Catering	***26.33***	22	100.00%	100.00%	2.25	**10.21%**	**11.10%**	30.00%	-15.06%	0.01232		***29.02***	***10.21%***
Communications - VHF/UHF-FM	***48.48***	22	100.00%	100.00%	1.63	**7.41%**	**12.71%**	30.00%	-22.17%	0.01615		***52.07***	***7.41%***
Communications - HF	***16.95***	19	100.00%	86.36%	1.42	**6.44%**	**13.90%**	30.00%	-33.89%	0.01932		***18.04***	***6.44%***
Communications - Telephone	***14.07***	20	100.00%	90.91%	1.79	**8.14%**	**9.88%**	30.00%	-5.46%	0.00975		***15.22***	***8.14%***
Office	***22.72***	19	100.00%	86.36%	2.04	**9.29%**	**15.42%**	61.00%	-5.92%	0.02378		***24.83***	***9.29%***
Electrical	***27.85***	18	100.00%	81.82%	1.45	**6.61%**	**14.20%**	30.00%	-33.05%	0.02016		***29.69***	***6.61%***
Minor Engineering	***15.95***	18	100.00%	81.82%	2.03	**9.24%**	**11.56%**	37.00%	0.00%	0.01337		***17.42***	***9.24%***
Explosive Ordnance Disposal (EOD)	***7.27***	17	100.00%	77.27%	1.54	**6.99%**	**11.69%**	37.00%	-0.70%	0.01365		***7.78***	***6.99%***
Laundry and cleaning	***22.05***	20	100.00%	90.91%	1.60	**7.25%**	**15.34%**	30.00%	-44.42%	0.02353		***23.65***	***7.25%***
Tentage	***22.60***	20	100.00%	90.91%	2.06	**9.34%**	**11.81%**	41.00%	0.00%	0.01394		***24.71***	***9.34%***
Accommodation	***38.52***	16	100.00%	72.73%	1.16	**5.29%**	**12.05%**	34.00%	-22.95%	0.01453		***40.56***	***5.29%***
Observation - General	***1.07***	16	84.21%	72.73%	1.46	**6.64%**	**9.28%**	30.00%	0.00%	0.00862		***1.14***	***6.64%***
Observation - Night Observation	***23.95***	16	84.21%	72.73%	1.46	**6.62%**	**9.19%**	30.00%	-3.75%	0.00845		***25.54***	***6.62%***
Observation - Positioning	***5.45***	16	84.21%	72.73%	1.25	**5.67%**	**8.34%**	30.00%	0.00%	0.00696		***5.76***	***5.67%***
Identification	***1.06***	7	100.00%	31.82%	0.38	**1.74%**	**9.35%**	23.00%	-8.00%	0.00875		***1.08***	***1.74%***
NBCP	***25.59***	15	100.00%	68.18%	0.42	**1.92%**	**12.68%**	42.00%	-14.95%	0.01608		***26.09***	***1.92%***
Base defence store	***33.62***	16	100.00%	72.73%	1.48	**6.71%**	**7.22%**	23.00%	0.00%	0.00521		***35.88***	***6.71%***
Miscellaneous - Bedding	***15.13***	21	100.00%	95.45%	1.63	**7.40%**	**14.44%**	31.00%	-30.00%	0.02085		***16.25***	***7.40%***
Miscellaneous - Furniture	***22.03***	21	100.00%	95.45%	1.64	**7.45%**	**13.46%**	34.00%	-30.00%	0.01811		***23.67***	***7.45%***
Miscellaneous - Welfare	***6.01***	22	100.00%	100.00%	1.90	**8.65%**	**14.86%**	45.00%	-30.00%	0.02207		***6.53***	***8.65%***
Total	***396.70***											***424.91***	***7.11%***

Statistical model calculations

Cut 20

Impact on UN budget

Categories	% of total UN budget	Weighted average	
Catering	7.88%	0.80%	
Communications - VHF/UHF-FM	6.54%	0.48%	=19.62% / 3
Communications - HF	3.54%	0.42%	=19.62% / 3
Communications - Telephone	6.54%	0.53%	=19.62% / 3
Office	6.17%	0.57%	
Electrical	6.23%	0.41%	
Minor Engineering	4.42%	0.41%	
Explosive Ordnance Disposal (EOD)	2.17%	0.15%	
Laundry and cleaning	6.86%	0.50%	
Tentage	5.28%	0.49%	
Accommodation	1.84%	0.10%	
Observation - General	2.90%	0.19%	=8.7% / 3
Observation - Night Observation	2.90%	0.19%	=8.7% / 3
Observation - Positioning	2.90%	0.16%	=8.7% / 3
Identification	0.00%	0.00%	
NBCP	0.00%	0.00%	
Base defence store	1.64%	0.11%	
Miscellaneous - Bedding	4.41%	0.33%	=13.24% / 3
Miscellaneous - Furniture	4.41%	0.33%	=13.24% / 3
Miscellaneous - Welfare	4.41%	0.38%	=13.24% / 3
	84.04%	**6.57%**	

NEW WEIGHTED AVERAGE

% of total UN budget	New weighted average	
7.88%	9.38%	0.96%
6.54%	7.78%	0.58%
6.54%	7.78%	0.50%
6.54%	7.78%	0.63%
6.17%	7.34%	0.68%
6.23%	7.41%	0.49%
4.42%	5.26%	0.49%
2.17%	2.58%	0.18%
6.86%	8.16%	0.59%
5.28%	6.28%	0.59%
1.84%	2.19%	0.12%
2.90%	3.45%	0.23%
2.90%	3.45%	0.23%
2.90%	3.45%	0.20%
0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
1.64%	1.95%	0.13%
4.41%	5.25%	0.39%
4.41%	5.25%	0.39%
4.41%	5.25%	0.45%
84.05%	100.00%	**7.82%**

Statistical model calculations

Cut 15

Categories	*Current*	Argentina	Austria	Bangladesh	Brazil	Burkina Faso	Canada	China	Denmark	France	India	Italy	Japan	Jordan
Catering	***26.33***	2.44%	-15.06%	30.00%	1.00%	n/a	10.45%	2.00%	6.22%	2.00%	29.00%	2.85%	1.00%	5.63%
Communications - VHF/UHF-FM	***48.48***	6.11%	-22.17%	30.00%	1.50%	10.00%	-11.65%	2.00%	6.22%	2.00%	26.00%	5.41%	-2.00%	7.52%
Communications - HF	***16.95***	6.11%	0.00%	30.00%	4.00%	n/a	-33.89%	2.00%	6.22%	2.00%	n/a	1.81%	-2.00%	7.52%
Communications - Telephone	***14.07***	6.11%	-5.46%	30.00%	2.50%	n/a	8.32%	2.00%	6.22%	2.00%	n/a	1.54%	-2.00%	7.52%
Office	***22.72***	2.44%	n/a		1.50%	2.00%		2.00%	6.22%	2.00%		2.52%	4.40%	8.72%
Electrical	***27.85***	0.64%	-33.05%	30.00%	4.00%	n/a	0.00%	2.00%	6.22%	2.00%	27.00%	2.97%	n/a	6.80%
Minor Engineering	***15.95***	2.44%	8.37%	30.00%	5.00%	n/a	0.00%	2.00%	6.22%	2.00%	27.00%	1.66%	n/a	5.57%
Explosive Ordnance Disposal (EOD)	***7.27***	2.44%	-0.70%	30.00%	4.00%	n/a	0.00%	2.00%	6.22%	2.00%	29.00%	0.77%	n/a	2.64%
Laundry and cleaning	***22.05***	2.44%			0.00%	n/a	13.11%	2.00%	6.22%	2.00%		2.98%	n/a	7.85%
Tentage	***22.60***	2.44%	0.00%	23.00%	4.00%	n/a	0.00%	2.00%	6.22%	2.00%	27.00%	2.38%	7.00%	8.69%
Accommodation	***38.52***	2.44%	20.99%	n/a	2.00%	n/a	-22.95%	2.00%	6.22%	2.00%	n/a	4.28%	n/a	8.69%
Observation - General	***1.07***	6.11%	n/a	30.00%	2.00%	n/a	0.00%	2.00%	6.22%	2.00%	25.00%	1.19%		4.42%
Observation - Night Observation	***23.95***	6.11%	21.88%	30.00%	0.00%	n/a	-3.75%	2.00%	6.22%	2.00%	n/a	2.76%		4.42%
Observation - Positioning	***5.45***	6.11%	4.25%	30.00%	3.00%	n/a	0.00%	2.00%	6.22%	2.00%	n/a	0.59%		4.42%
Identification	***1.06***	6.11%	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	-8.00%	n/a	6.22%	2.00%	23.00%	1.20%	n/a	7.69%
NBCP	***25.59***	6.11%	-12.97%	n/a	1.00%	n/a	-14.95%	n/a	6.22%	2.00%	n/a	2.88%	-4.70%	8.89%
Base defence store	***33.62***	6.11%	n/a	n/a	4.00%	n/a	20.33%	2.00%	6.22%	2.00%	23.00%	3.59%	9.30%	7.53%
Miscellaneous - Bedding	***15.13***	2.44%	-13.73%	30.00%	3.00%	n/a	0.00%	2.00%	6.22%	2.00%	28.00%	1.66%	6.00%	8.24%
Miccellaneous - Furniture	***22.03***	2.44%	0.00%	30.00%	0.00%	n/a	0.00%	2.00%	6.22%	2.00%	28.00%	2.78%	6.00%	7.25%
Miscellaneous - Welfare	***6.01***	2.44%	9.12%	30.00%	0.00%	0.50%	-3.70%	2.00%	6.22%	2.00%	28.00%	0.59%	6.00%	8.32%
Total	***396.70***													

Statistical model calculations

Cut 15

Categories	Pakistan	Poland	Russia	Sweden	Thailand	Tunisia	Turkey	Ukraine	Uruguay	Zambia	Zimbabwe	No	Average
Catering	20.00%	3.68%	29.00%	6.40%	7.21%	14.00%	n/a	15.00%	19.68%	20.40%	11.69%	22	***10.21%***
Communications - VHF/UHF-FM	20.00%	n/a	27.00%	4.60%	8.60%	28.24%	0.02%	n/a	4.37%	9.00%	0.30%	22	***7.41%***
Communications - HF	20.00%	n/a	27.00%	4.60%	10.44%	28.24%	n/a	n/a	6.89%	9.00%	11.69%	19	***7.45%***
Communications - Telephone	20.00%	6.71%	27.00%	4.60%	8.60%	28.24%	n/a	n/a	4.50%	9.00%	11.69%	20	***8.95%***
Office	20.00%	n/a	19.00%	4.60%	2.89%	n/a	n/a	n/a	2.27%		11.69%	15	***6.15%***
Electrical	20.00%	n/a	28.00%	4.60%	17.29%	n/a	n/a	n/a	9.21%	6.00%	11.69%	18	***8.08%***
Minor Engineering	20.00%	n/a	37.00%	4.60%	2.89%	n/a	n/a	n/a	26.90%	10.00%	11.69%	18	***11.30%***
Explosive Ordnance Disposal (EOD)	n/a	n/a	37.00%	4.60%	8.60%	n/a	n/a	n/a	12.45%	1.00%	11.69%	17	***9.04%***
Laundry and cleaning	20.00%	3.83%		6.40%	12.08%	14.08%	n/a	n/a	15.27%	1.00%	11.69%	16	***7.56%***
Tentage	20.00%	n/a	30.00%	4.60%	8.60%	n/a	n/a	0.00%	1.57%	41.00%	15.00%	20	***10.28%***
Accommodation	20.00%	n/a	34.00%	6.40%	8.60%	n/a	n/a	n/a	10.06%	0.00%	11.69%	16	***7.28%***
Observation - General	20.00%	n/a		4.60%	8.60%	18.62%	n/a	n/a	3.53%		11.69%	16	***9.12%***
Observation - Night Observation	20.00%	n/a		4.60%	8.60%	18.62%	n/a	n/a	10.57%		11.69%	16	***9.11%***
Observation - Positioning	20.00%	n/a		4.60%	8.60%	18.62%	n/a	n/a	2.70%		11.69%	16	***7.80%***
Identification	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	7	***5.46%***
NBCP	n/a	1.47%	42.00%	4.60%	n/a	n/a	0.02%	n/a	-0.33%	0.00%	n/a	15	***2.82%***
Base defence store	n/a	n/a	17.00%	4.60%	8.60%	n/a	n/a	n/a	18.34%	0.00%	15.00%	16	***9.23%***
Miscellaneous - Bedding	20.00%	n/a	31.00%	6.40%	8.60%	9.00%	0.37%	n/a	26.67%	-30.00%	15.00%	21	***7.76%***
Miscellaneous - Furniture	20.00%	n/a	34.00%	6.40%	8.60%	9.00%	0.37%	n/a	13.87%	-30.00%	15.00%	21	***7.81%***
Miscellaneous - Welfare	20.00%	n/a	45.00%	6.40%	8.60%	9.00%	0.37%	n/a	24.41%	-30.00%	15.00%	22	***8.65%***
												22	

Statistical model calculations

Cut 15

Categories	Current Rates	QTY DATA	Factor data	Handicap	Sum of input values	Average with handicap	ST-DEV	MAX	MIN	VARIANCE		NEW RATES	INCREASE
Catering	26.33	22	100.00%	100.00%	2.25	10.21%	11.10%	30.00%	-15.06%	0.01232		29.02	10.21%
Communications - VHF/UHF-FM	48.48	22	100.00%	100.00%	1.63	7.41%	12.71%	30.00%	-22.17%	0.01615		52.07	7.41%
Communications - HF	16.95	19	100.00%	86.36%	1.42	6.44%	13.90%	30.00%	-33.89%	0.01932		18.04	6.44%
Communications - Telephone	14.07	20	100.00%	90.91%	1.79	8.14%	9.88%	30.00%	-5.46%	0.00975		15.22	8.14%
Office	22.72	15	78.95%	68.18%	0.92	4.19%	6.13%	20.00%	1.50%	0.00375		23.67	4.19%
Electrical	27.85	18	100.00%	81.82%	1.45	6.61%	14.20%	30.00%	-33.05%	0.02016		29.69	6.61%
Minor Engineering	15.95	18	100.00%	81.82%	2.03	9.24%	11.56%	37.00%	0.00%	0.01337		17.42	9.24%
Explosive Ordnance Disposal (EOD)	7.27	17	100.00%	77.27%	1.54	6.99%	11.69%	37.00%	-0.70%	0.01365		7.78	6.99%
Laundry and cleaning	22.05	16	80.00%	72.73%	1.21	5.50%	6.06%	20.00%	0.00%	0.00368		23.26	5.50%
Tentage	22.60	20	100.00%	90.91%	2.06	9.34%	11.81%	41.00%	0.00%	0.01394		24.71	9.34%
Accommodation	38.52	16	100.00%	72.73%	1.16	5.29%	12.05%	34.00%	-22.95%	0.01453		40.56	5.29%
Observation - General	1.07	16	84.21%	72.73%	1.46	6.64%	9.28%	30.00%	0.00%	0.00862		1.14	6.64%
Observation - Night Observation	23.95	16	84.21%	72.73%	1.46	6.62%	9.19%	30.00%	-3.75%	0.00845		25.54	6.62%
Observation - Positioning	5.45	16	84.21%	72.73%	1.25	5.67%	8.34%	30.00%	0.00%	0.00696		5.76	5.67%
Identification	1.06	7	100.00%	31.82%	0.38	1.74%	9.35%	23.00%	-8.00%	0.00875		1.08	1.74%
NBCP	25.59	15	100.00%	68.18%	0.42	1.92%	12.68%	42.00%	-14.95%	0.01603		26.08	1.92%
Base defence store	33.62	16	100.00%	72.73%	1.48	6.71%	7.22%	23.00%	0.00%	0.00521		35.88	6.71%
Miscellaneous - Bedding	15.13	21	100.00%	95.45%	1.63	7.40%	14.44%	31.00%	-30.00%	0.02085		16.25	7.40%
Miscellaneous - Furniture	22.03	21	100.00%	95.45%	1.64	7.45%	13.46%	34.00%	-30.00%	0.01811		23.67	7.45%
Miscellaneous - Welfare	6.01	22	100.00%	100.00%	1.90	8.65%	14.86%	45.00%	-30.00%	0.02207		6.53	8.65%
Total	396.70											423.37	6.72%

Statistical model calculations

Cut 15

Impact on UN budget

Categories	% of total UN budget	Weighted average	
Catering	7.88%	0.80%	
Communications - VHF/UHF-FM	6.54%	0.48%	=19.62% / 3
Communications - HF	6.54%	0.42%	=19.62% / 3
Communications - Telephone	6.54%	0.53%	=19.62% / 3
Office	6.17%	0.26%	
Electrical	6.23%	0.41%	
Minor Engineering	4.42%	0.41%	
Explosive Ordnance Disposal (EOD)	2.17%	0.15%	
Laundry and cleaning	6.86%	0.38%	
Tentage	5.28%	0.49%	
Accommodation	1.84%	0.10%	
Observation - General	2.90%	0.19%	=8.7% / 3
Observation - Night Observation	2.90%	0.19%	=8.7% / 3
Observation - Positioning	2.90%	0.16%	=8.7% / 3
Identification	0.00%	0.00%	
NBCP	0.00%	0.00%	
Base defence store	1.64%	0.11%	
Miscellaneous - Bedding	4.41%	0.33%	=13.24% / 3
Miscellaneous - Furniture	4.41%	0.33%	=13.24% / 3
Miscellaneous - Welfare	4.41%	0.38%	=13.24% / 3
	84.04%	**6.14%**	

NEW WEIGHTED AVERAGE

% of total UN budget	New weighted average	
7.88%	9.38%	0.96%
6.54%	7.78%	0.58%
6.54%	7.78%	0.50%
6.54%	7.78%	0.63%
6.17%	7.34%	0.31%
6.23%	7.41%	0.49%
4.42%	5.26%	0.49%
2.17%	2.58%	0.18%
6.66%	8.16%	0.45%
5.28%	6.28%	0.59%
1.84%	2.19%	0.12%
2.90%	3.45%	0.23%
2.90%	3.45%	0.23%
2.90%	3.45%	0.20%
0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
1.64%	1.95%	0.13%
4.41%	5.25%	0.39%
4.41%	5.25%	0.39%
4.41%	5.25%	0.45%
84.05%	100.00%	**7.30%**

Statistical model calculations

Cut 10

Categories	*Current*	Argentina	Austria	Bangladesh	Brazil	Burkina Faso	Canada	China	Denmark	France	India	Italy	Japan	Jordan
Catering	***26.33***	2.44%			1.00%	n/a	10.45%	2.00%	6.22%	2.00%		2.85%	1.00%	5.63%
Communications - VHF/UHF-FM	***48.48***	6.11%			1.50%	10.00%		2.00%	6.22%	2.00%		5.41%	-2.00%	7.52%
Communications - HF	***16.95***	6.11%	0.00%		4.00%	n/a		2.00%	6.22%	2.00%	n/a	1.81%	-2.00%	7.52%
Communications - Telephone	***14.07***	6.11%	-5.46%	30.00%	2.50%	n/a	8.32%	2.00%	6.22%	2.00%	n/a	1.54%	-2.00%	7.52%
Office	***22.72***	2.44%	n/a		1.50%	2.00%		2.00%	6.22%	2.00%		2.52%	4.40%	8.72%
Electrical	***27.85***	0.64%			4.00%	n/a	0.00%	2.00%	6.22%	2.00%		2.97%	n/a	6.80%
Minor Engineering	***15.95***	2.44%	8.37%		5.00%	n/a	0.00%	2.00%	6.22%	2.00%		1.66%	n/a	5.57%
Explosive Ordnance Disposal (EOD)	***7.27***	2.44%	-0.70%		4.00%	n/a	0.00%	2.00%	6.22%	2.00%		0.77%	n/a	2.64%
Laundry and cleaning	***22.05***	2.44%			0.00%	n/a	13.11%	2.00%	6.22%	2.00%		2.98%	n/a	7.85%
Tentage	***22.60***	2.44%	0.00%		4.00%	n/a	0.00%	2.00%	6.22%	2.00%		2.38%	7.00%	8.69%
Accommodation	***38.52***	2.44%		n/a	2.00%	n/a		2.00%	6.22%	2.00%	n/a	4.28%	n/a	8.69%
Observation - General	***1.07***	6.11%	n/a	30.00%	2.00%	n/a	0.00%	2.00%	6.22%	2.00%	25.00%	1.19%		4.42%
Observation - Night Observation	***23.95***	6.11%	21.88%	30.00%	0.00%	n/a	-3.75%	2.00%	6.22%	2.00%	n/a	2.76%		4.42%
Observation - Positioning	***5.45***	6.11%	4.25%	30.00%	3.00%	n/a	0.00%	2.00%	6.22%	2.00%	n/a	0.59%		4.42%
Identification	***1.09***	6.11%	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	-8.00%	n/a	6.22%	2.00%	23.00%	1.20%	n/a	7.69%
NBCP	***25.59***	6.11%		n/a	1.00%	n/a		n/a	6.22%	2.00%	n/a	2.88%	-4.70%	8.89%
Base defence store	***33.62***	6.11%	n/a	n/a	4.00%	n/a	20.33%	2.00%	6.22%	2.00%	23.00%	3.59%	9.30%	7.53%
Miscellaneous - Bedding	***15.13***	2.44%			3.00%	n/a	0.00%	2.00%	6.22%	2.00%		1.66%	6.00%	8.24%
Miscellaneous - Furniture	***22.03***	2.44%	0.00%		0.00%	n/a	0.00%	2.00%	6.22%	2.00%		2.78%	6.00%	7.25%
Miscellaneous - Welfare	***6.01***	2.44%	9.12%		0.00%	0.50%		2.00%	6.22%	2.00%		0.59%	6.00%	8.32%
Total	***396.70***													

Statistical model calculations

Cut 10

Categories	Pakistan	Poland	Russia	Sweden	Thailand	Tunisia	Turkey	Ukraine	Uruguay	Zambia	Zimbabwe	No	Average
Catering	20.00%	3.68%		6.40%	7.21%	14.00%	n/a	15.00%	19.68%		11.69%	17	**7.72%**
Communications - VHF/UHF-FM		n/a		4.60%	8.60%		0.02%	n/a	4.37%	9.00%	0.30%	15	**4.38%**
Communications - HF		n/a		4.60%	10.44%		n/a	n/a	6.89%	9.00%	11.69%	14	**5.02%**
Communications - Telephone	20.00%	6.71%	27.00%	4.60%	8.60%	28.24%	n/a	n/a	4.50%	9.00%	11.69%	20	**8.95%**
Office	20.00%	n/a	19.00%	4.60%	2.89%	n/a	n/a	n/a	2.27%		11.69%	15	**8.15%**
Electrical		n/a		4.60%		n/a	n/a	n/a	9.21%	6.00%	11.69%	12	**4.68%**
Minor Engineering		n/a		4.60%	2.89%	n/a	n/a	n/a		10.00%	11.69%	13	**4.80%**
Explosive Ordnance Disposal (EOD)	n/a	n/a		4.60%	8.60%	n/a	n/a	n/a	12.45%	1.00%	11.69%	14	**4.12%**
Laundry and cleaning	20.00%	3.83%		6.40%	12.08%	14.08%	n/a	n/a	15.27%	1.00%	11.69%	16	**7.56%**
Tentage		n/a		4.60%	8.60%	n/a	n/a	0.00%	1.57%		15.00%	15	**4.30%**
Accommodation		n/a		6.40%	8.60%	n/a	n/a	n/a	10.06%	0.00%	11.69%	12	**5.37%**
Observation - General	20.00%	n/a		4.60%	8.60%	18.62%	n/a	n/a	3.53%		11.69%	16	**9.12%**
Observation - Night Observation	20.00%	n/a		4.60%	8.60%	18.62%	n/a	n/a	10.57%		11.69%	16	**9.11%**
Observation - Positioning	20.00%	n/a		4.60%	8.60%	18.62%	n/a	n/a	2.70%		11.69%	16	**7.80%**
Identification	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	7	**5.46%**
NBCP	n/a	1.47%		4.60%	n/a	n/a	0.02%	n/a	-0.33%	0.00%	n/a	12	**2.35%**
Base defence store	n/a	n/a	17.00%	4.60%	8.60%	n/a	n/a	n/a	18.34%	0.00%	15.00%	16	**9.23%**
Miscellaneous - Bedding		n/a		6.40%	8.60%	9.00%	0.37%	n/a			15.00%	14	**5.07%**
Miscellaneous - Furniture		n/a		6.40%	8.60%	9.00%	0.37%	n/a	13.87%		15.00%	16	**5.12%**
Miscellaneous - Welfare		n/a		6.40%	8.60%	9.00%	0.37%	n/a			15.00%	15	**5.10%**
												20	

Statistical model calculations

Cut 10

Categories	Current Rates	QTY DATA	Factor data	Handicap	Sum of input values	Average with handicap	ST-DEV	MAX	MIN	VARIANCE		NEW RATES	INCREASE
Catering	***26.33***	17	77.27%	85.00%	1.31	**6.56%**	**6.33%**	20.00%	1.00%	0.00401		***28.06***	***6.56%***
Communications - VHF/UHF-FM	***48.48***	15	68.18%	75.00%	0.66	**3.28%**	**3.63%**	10.00%	-2.00%	0.00131		***50.07***	***3.28%***
Communications - HF	***16.95***	14	73.68%	70.00%	0.70	**3.51%**	**3.98%**	11.69%	-2.00%	0.00159		***17.55***	***3.51%***
Communications - Telephone	***14.07***	20	100.00%	100.00%	1.79	**8.95%**	**9.88%**	30.00%	-5.46%	0.00975		***15.33***	***8.95%***
Office	***22.72***	15	78.95%	75.00%	0.92	**4.61%**	**6.13%**	20.00%	1.50%	0.00375		***23.77***	***4.61%***
Electrical	***27.85***	12	66.67%	60.00%	0.56	**2.81%**	**3.49%**	11.69%	0.00%	0.00122		***28.63***	***2.81%***
Minor Engineering	***15.95***	13	72.22%	65.00%	0.62	**3.12%**	**3.51%**	11.69%	0.00%	0.00123		***16.45***	***3.12%***
Explosive Ordnance Disposal (EOD)	***7.27***	14	82.35%	70.00%	0.58	**2.89%**	**4.17%**	12.45%	-0.70%	0.00174		***7.48***	***2.89%***
Laundry and cleaning	***22.05***	16	80.00%	80.00%	1.21	**6.05%**	**6.06%**	20.00%	0.00%	0.00368		***23.38***	***6.05%***
Tentage	***22.60***	15	75.00%	75.00%	0.65	**3.23%**	**4.18%**	15.00%	0.00%	0.00174		***23.33***	***3.22%***
Accommodation	***38.52***	12	75.00%	60.00%	0.64	**3.22%**	**3.79%**	11.69%	0.00%	0.00144		***39.76***	***3.22%***
Observation - General	***1.07***	16	84.21%	80.00%	1.46	**7.30%**	**9.28%**	30.00%	0.00%	0.00862		***1.15***	***7.30%***
Observation - Night Observation	***23.95***	16	84.21%	80.00%	1.46	**7.29%**	**9.19%**	30.00%	-3.75%	0.00845		***25.69***	***7.29%***
Observation - Positioning	***5.45***	16	84.21%	80.00%	1.25	**6.24%**	**8.34%**	30.00%	0.00%	0.00696		***5.79***	***6.24%***
Identification	***1.06***	7	100.00%	35.00%	0.38	**1.91%**	**9.35%**	23.00%	-8.00%	0.00875		***1.08***	***1.91%***
NBCP	***25.59***	12	80.00%	60.00%	0.28	**1.41%**	**3.67%**	8.89%	-4.70%	0.00134		***25.95***	***1.41%***
Base defence store	***33.62***	16	100.00%	80.00%	1.48	**7.38%**	**7.22%**	23.00%	0.00%	0.00521		***36.10***	***7.38%***
Miscellaneous - Bedding	***15.13***	14	66.67%	70.00%	0.71	**3.55%**	**4.21%**	15.00%	0.00%	0.00177		***15.67***	***3.55%***
Miscellaneous - Furniture	***22.03***	16	76.19%	80.00%	0.82	**4.10%**	**4.78%**	15.00%	0.00%	0.00229		***22.93***	***4.10%***
Miscellaneous - Welfare	***6.01***	15	68.18%	75.00%	0.77	**3.83%**	**4.41%**	15.00%	0.00%	0.00194		***6.24***	***3.83%***
Total	***396.70***											***414.41***	***4.46%***

Statistical model calculations

Cut 10

Impact on UN budget

Categories	% of total UN budget	Weighted average	
Catering	7.88%	0.52%	
Communications - VHF/UHF-FM	6.54%	0.21%	=19.62% / 3
Communications - HF	6.54%	0.23%	=19.62% / 3
Communications - Telephone	6.54%	0.59%	=19.62% / 3
Office	6.17%	0.28%	
Electrical	6.23%	0.17%	
Minor Engineering	4.42%	0.14%	
Explosive Ordnance Disposal (EOD)	2.17%	0.06%	
Laundry and cleaning	6.86%	0.41%	
Tentage	5.28%	0.17%	
Accommodation	1.84%	0.06%	
Observation - General	2.90%	0.21%	=8.7% / 3
Observation - Night Observation	2.90%	0.21%	=8.7% / 3
Observation - Positioning	2.90%	0.18%	=8.7% / 3
Identification	0.00%	0.00%	
NBCP	0.00%	0.00%	
Base defence store	1.64%	0.12%	
Miscellaneous - Bedding	4.41%	0.16%	=13.24% / 3
Miscellaneous - Furniture	4.41%	0.18%	=13.24% / 3
Miscellaneous - Welfare	4.41%	0.17%	=13.24% / 3
	84.04%	**4.08%**	

NEW WEIGHTED AVERAGE		
% of total UN budget	New weighted average	
7.88%	9.38%	0.62%
6.54%	7.78%	0.26%
6.54%	7.78%	0.27%
6.54%	7.78%	0.70%
6.17%	7.34%	0.34%
6.23%	7.41%	0.21%
4.42%	5.26%	0.18%
2.17%	2.58%	0.07%
6.86%	8.16%	0.49%
5.28%	6.28%	0.20%
1.84%	2.19%	0.07%
2.90%	3.45%	0.25%
2.90%	3.45%	0.25%
2.90%	3.45%	0.22%
0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
1.64%	1.95%	0.14%
4.41%	5.25%	0.19%
4.41%	5.25%	0.22%
4.41%	5.25%	0.20%
84.05%	100.00%	**4.86%**

Statistical model calculations

Cut 6

Categories	*Current*	Argentina	Austria	Bangladesh	Brazil	Burkina Faso	Canada	China	Denmark	France	India	Italy	Japan	Jordan
Catering	***26.33***	2.44%			1.00%	n/a	10.45%	2.00%	6.22%	2.00%		2.85%	1.00%	5.63%
Communications - VHF/UHF-FM	***48.48***	6.11%			1.50%	10.00%		2.00%	6.22%	2.00%		5.41%	-2.00%	7.52%
Communications - HF	***16.95***	6.11%	0.00%		4.00%	n/a		2.00%	6.22%	2.00%	n/a	1.81%	-2.00%	7.52%
Communications - Telephone	***14.07***	6.11%				n/a	8.32%		6.22%		n/a			7.52%
Office	***22.72***	2.44%	n/a		1.50%	2.00%		2.00%	6.22%	2.00%		2.52%	4.40%	8.72%
Electrical	***27.85***	0.64%			4.00%	n/a	0.00%	2.00%	6.22%	2.00%		2.97%	n/a	6.80%
Minor Engineering	***15.95***	2.44%	8.37%		5.00%	n/a	0.00%	2.00%	6.22%	2.00%		1.66%	n/a	5.57%
Explosive Ordnance Disposal (EOD)	***7.27***	2.44%	-0.70%		4.00%	n/a	0.00%	2.00%	6.22%	2.00%		0.77%	n/a	2.64%
Laundry and cleaning	***22.05***	2.44%				n/a		2.00%	6.22%	2.00%		2.98%	n/a	7.85%
Tentage	***22.60***	2.44%	0.00%		4.00%	n/a	0.00%	2.00%	6.22%	2.00%		2.38%	7.00%	8.69%
Accommodation	***38.52***	2.44%		n/a	2.00%	n/a		2.00%	6.22%	2.00%	n/a	4.28%	n/a	8.69%
Observation - General	***1.07***	6.11%	n/a		2.00%	n/a		2.00%	6.22%	2.00%				4.42%
Observation - Night Observation	***23.95***	6.11%				n/a		2.00%	6.22%	2.00%	n/a	2.76%		4.42%
Observation - Positioning	***5.45***	6.11%	4.25%		3.00%	n/a		2.00%	6.22%	2.00%	n/a	0.59%		4.42%
Identification	***1.06***	6.11%	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a		n/a	6.22%	2.00%		1.20%	n/a	7.69%
NBCP	***25.59***	6.11%		n/a	1.00%	n/a		n/a	6.22%	2.00%	n/a	2.88%	-4.70%	8.89%
Base defence store	***33.62***	6.11%	n/a	n/a	4.00%	n/a		2.00%	6.22%	2.00%		3.59%	9.30%	7.53%
Miscellaneous - Bedding	***15.13***	2.44%			3.00%	n/a	0.00%	2.00%	6.22%	2.00%		1.66%	6.00%	8.24%
Miscellaneous - Furniture	***22.03***	2.44%	0.00%		0.00%	n/a	0.00%	2.00%	6.22%	2.00%		2.78%	6.00%	7.25%
Miscellaneous - Welfare	***6.01***	2.44%	9.12%		0.00%	0.50%		2.00%	6.22%	2.00%		0.59%	6.00%	8.32%
Total	***396.70***													

Statistical model calculations

Cut 6

Categories	Pakistan	Poland	Russia	Sweden	Thailand	Tunisia	Turkey	Ukraine	Uruguay	Zambia	Zimbabwe	No	Average
Catering		3.68%		6.40%	7.21%		n/a				11.69%	13	***4.81%***
Communications - VHF/UHF-FM		n/a		4.60%	8.60%		0.02%	n/a	4.37%	9.00%	0.30%	15	***4.38%***
Communications - HF		n/a		4.60%	10.44%		n/a	n/a	6.89%	9.00%	11.69%	14	***5.02%***
Communications - Telephone		6.71%		4.60%	8.60%		n/a	n/a	4.50%	9.00%	11.69%	10	***7.33%***
Office		n/a		4.60%	2.89%	n/a	n/a	n/a	2.27%			12	***3.46%***
Electrical		n/a		4.60%		n/a	n/a	n/a	9.21%	6.00%	11.69%	12	***4.68%***
Minor Engineering		n/a		4.60%	2.89%	n/a	n/a	n/a		10.00%	11.69%	13	***4.80%***
Explosive Ordnance Disposal (EOD)	n/a	n/a		4.60%	8.60%	n/a	n/a	n/a	12.45%	1.00%	11.69%	14	***4.12%***
Laundry and cleaning		3.83%		6.40%			n/a	n/a		1.00%	11.69%	10	***4.64%***
Tentage		n/a		4.60%	8.60%	n/a	n/a	0.00%	1.57%		15.00%	15	***4.30%***
Accommodation		n/a		6.40%	8.60%	n/a	n/a	n/a	10.06%	0.00%	11.69%	12	***5.37%***
Observation - General		n/a		4.60%	8.60%		n/a	n/a	3.53%		11.69%	10	***5.12%***
Observation - Night Observation		n/a		4.60%	8.60%		n/a	n/a	10.57%		11.69%	10	***5.90%***
Observation - Positioning		n/a		4.60%	8.60%		n/a	n/a	2.70%		11.69%	12	***4.68%***
Identification	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	5	***4.64%***
NBCP	n/a	1.47%		4.60%	n/a	n/a	0.02%	n/a	-0.33%	0.00%	n/a	12	***2.35%***
Base defence store	n/a	n/a	17.00%	4.60%	8.60%	n/a	n/a	n/a				11	***6.45%***
Miscellaneous - Bedding		n/a		6.40%	8.60%	9.00%	0.37%	n/a			15.00%	14	***5.07%***
Miscellaneous - Furniture		n/a		6.40%	8.60%	9.00%	0.37%	n/a	13.87%		15.00%	16	***5.12%***
Miscellaneous - Welfare		n/a		6.40%	8.60%	9.00%	0.37%	n/a			15.00%	15	***5.10%***
												16	

Statistical model calculations

Cut 6

Categories	Current Rates	QTY DATA	Factor data	Handicap	Sum of input values	Average with handicap	ST-DEV	MAX	MIN	VARIANCE		NEW RATES	INCREASE
Catering	***26.33***	13	59.09%	81.25%	0.63	**3.91%**	**3.48%**	11.69%	1.00%	0.00121		***27.36***	***3.91%***
Communications - VHF/UHF-FM	***48.48***	15	68.18%	93.75%	0.66	**4.10%**	**3.63%**	10.00%	-2.00%	0.00131		***50.47***	***4.10%***
Communications - HF	***16.95***	14	73.68%	87.50%	0.70	**4.39%**	**3.98%**	11.69%	-2.00%	0.00159		***17.69***	***4.39%***
Communications - Telephone	***14.07***	10	50.00%	62.50%	0.73	**4.58%**	**2.19%**	11.69%	4.50%	0.00048		***14.71***	***4.58%***
Office	***22.72***	12	63.16%	75.00%	0.42	**2.60%**	**2.16%**	8.72%	1.50%	0.00047		***23.31***	***2.60%***
Electrical	***27.85***	12	66.67%	75.00%	0.56	**3.51%**	**3.49%**	11.69%	0.00%	0.00122		***28.83***	***3.51%***
Minor Engineering	***15.95***	13	72.22%	81.25%	0.62	**3.90%**	**3.51%**	11.69%	0.00%	0.00123		***16.57***	***3.90%***
Explosive Ordnance Disposal (EOD)	***7.27***	14	82.35%	87.50%	0.58	**3.61%**	**4.17%**	12.45%	-0.70%	0.00174		***7.53***	***3.61%***
Laundry and cleaning	***22.05***	10	50.00%	62.50%	0.46	**2.90%**	**3.35%**	11.69%	1.00%	0.00112		***22.69***	***2.90%***
Tentage	***22.60***	15	75.00%	93.75%	0.65	**4.03%**	**4.18%**	15.00%	0.00%	0.00174		***23.51***	***4.03%***
Accommodation	***38.52***	12	75.00%	75.00%	0.64	**4.02%**	**3.79%**	11.69%	0.00%	0.00144		***40.07***	***4.02%***
Observation - General	***1.07***	10	52.63%	62.50%	0.51	**3.20%**	**3.16%**	11.69%	2.00%	0.00100		***1.10***	***3.20%***
Observation - Night Observation	***23.95***	10	52.63%	62.50%	0.59	**3.69%**	**3.45%**	11.69%	2.00%	0.00119		***24.83***	***3.69%***
Observation - Positioning	***5.45***	12	63.16%	75.00%	0.56	**3.51%**	**3.12%**	11.69%	0.59%	0.00097		***5.64***	***3.51%***
Identification	***1.06***	5	71.43%	31.25%	0.23	**1.45%**	**2.86%**	7.69%	1.20%	0.00082		***1.08***	***1.45%***
NBCP	***25.59***	12	80.00%	75.00%	0.28	**1.76%**	**3.67%**	8.89%	-4.70%	0.00134		***26.04***	***1.76%***
Base defence store	***33.62***	11	68.75%	68.75%	0.71	**4.43%**	**4.27%**	17.00%	2.00%	0.00183		***35.11***	***4.43%***
Miscellaneous - Bedding	***15.13***	14	66.67%	87.50%	0.71	**4.43%**	**4.21%**	15.00%	0.00%	0.00177		***15.80***	***4.43%***
Miscellaneous - Furniture	***22.03***	16	76.19%	100.00%	0.82	**5.12%**	**4.78%**	15.00%	0.00%	0.00229		***23.16***	***5.12%***
Miscellaneous - Welfare	***6.01***	15	68.18%	93.75%	0.77	**4.79%**	**4.41%**	15.00%	0.00%	0.00194		***6.30***	***4.78%***
Total	***396.70***											***411.81***	***3.81%***

Statistical model calculations

Cut 6

Impact on UN budget

Categories	% of total UN budget	Weighted average	
Catering	7.88%	0.31%	
Communications - VHF/UHF-FM	6.54%	0.27%	=19.62% / 3
Communications - HF	6.54%	0.29%	=19.62% / 3
Communications - Telephone	6.54%	0.30%	=19.62% / 3
Office	6.17%	0.16%	
Electrical	6.23%	0.22%	
Minor Engineering	4.42%	0.17%	
Explosive Ordnance Disposal (EOD)	2.17%	0.08%	
Laundry and cleaning	6.86%	0.20%	
Tentage	5.28%	0.21%	
Accommodation	1.84%	0.07%	
Observation - General	2.90%	0.09%	=8.7% / 3
Observation - Night Observation	2.90%	0.11%	=8.7% / 3
Observation - Positioning	2.90%	0.10%	=8.7% / 3
Identification	0.00%	0.00%	
NBCP	0.00%	0.00%	
Base defence store	1.64%	0.07%	
Miscellaneous - Bedding	4.41%	0.20%	=13.24% / 3
Miscellaneous - Furniture	4.41%	0.23%	=13.24% / 3
Miscellaneous - Welfare	4.41%	0.21%	=13.24% / 3
	84.04%	**3.29%**	

NEW WEIGHTED AVERAGE

% of total UN budget	New weighted average	
7.88%	9.38%	0.37%
6.54%	7.78%	0.32%
6.54%	7.78%	0.34%
6.54%	7.78%	0.36%
6.17%	7.34%	0.19%
6.23%	7.41%	0.26%
4.42%	5.26%	0.21%
2.17%	2.58%	0.09%
6.86%	8.16%	0.24%
5.28%	6.28%	0.25%
1.84%	2.19%	0.09%
2.90%	3.45%	0.11%
2.90%	3.45%	0.13%
2.90%	3.45%	0.12%
0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
1.64%	1.95%	0.09%
4.41%	5.25%	0.23%
4.41%	5.25%	0.27%
4.41%	5.25%	0.25%
84.05%	100.00%	**3.91%**

Annex II.A.2

Views expressed by one group of Member States on the review of reimbursement rates on self-sustainment

Background

1. The existing methodology for submission of data and the actual process of reviewing the reimbursement rates was established by mutual consensus in the Phase V Working Group in January 2000 and approved by the General Assembly. The methodology was based on the submission of cost indices based on the differences of rates in the beginning and end of the period under review. All the data made available to the Working Group has been collected based on the guidelines of the Secretariat and in accordance wit' accepted methodology.

The issue at hand

2. Having worked well within the parameters laid down as mentioned above, the Working Group worked very hard to review the available data and applied the established statistical analysis methodology to evolve a set of four representative values which ranged in budgetary impact from 8.34 to 4.86 per cent. Having done the entire exercise, the only step left was to apply one of the representative values to the existing United Nations rates so as to arrive at a recommended reviewed rate. A process of discussion then began to select the most appropriate rates. As a compromise, this group of Member States agreed to the lowest rate suggested by the approved model which is 4.86 per cent. At this juncture, some Member States suggested that the reviewed rates should not be in accordance with those which had been decided by the approved model. They instead offered an arbitrary rate of increase of 0.5 per cent without any statistical justification.

Recommended course of action

3. In view of the foregoing, the following recommendations are made:

(a) The existing model is based on sound statistical logic and enjoys the consensus of the last Working Group and approval of the General Assembly. Any changes should only be allowed through established channels, that is, a recommendation made by the Working Group to the General Assembly through the Fifth Committee;

(b) The submitted paper should only be treated as a proposal to be considered by the next Working Group in 2007, together with other proposals submitted by other Member States;

(c) The process of either adopting or not adopting "any" data-based methodology should also be addressed. Based on the fact that some Member States are willing to ignore completely an established methodology, the question of considering a new methodology becomes irrelevant;

(d) For all practical purposes of this Working Group, no departure should be allowed from the approved and adopted methodology;

(e) Any negotiations concerning the rates of reimbursement should be within the range established by the existing statistical model, as mentioned in paragraph 2 above.

Annex II.A.3

Views expressed by another group of Member States in support of the adoption of a moderate increase in reimbursement rates, coupled with the adoption of a new methodology for calculating reimbursement rates

Issue

1. During discussions of reimbursement rates at the Working Group, it became evident that two distinct factions emerged:

(a) Some Member States felt that reimbursement rates should be based on the current methodology without any other consideration;

(b) Other Member States felt that the current methodology was unreliable (due to the inability to compare current national data to the current United Nations rate) and therefore supported only a moderate increase in reimbursement rates this time, coupled with agreement that a new model should be used to collect data for the next Working Group in 2007 in parallel with the current methodology.

2. This position paper is issued by the Member States from faction 1 (b) above.

Background

3. The post-Phase V Working Group in 2001 recommended, with some reservations, a form of statistical methodology be used as a basis for future rate changes (see A/C.5/55/39, para. 72). The 2001 post-Phase V Working Group also suggested that in future, working groups should pursue the establishment of more effective and robust guidelines to provide a clearer description of the sample force to be used by all Member States and the formulation of proposed rates for the future (ibid., annex II.A). It is also important to note that the post-Phase V Working Group noted that some delegates expressed concern that the guidelines for the sample force provided by the Phase V Working Group to be used as a standard in the formulation of proposed rates lacked clarity, which may have caused Member States to submit imprecise calculations (ibid., para. 70).

4. This methodology was reached only after "significant discussion" (ibid., para. 72).

Difficulties at the 2004 Working Group

5. The difficulties that appeared to have taken root during the post-Phase V Working Group were reflected during the discussions at the 2004 Working Group. These primarily revolved around the following issues:

(a) The data submitted only reflected national percentage cost increases and decreases, that is, national cost in 2000, compared with 2002. That figure bore no relationship to the current United Nations rate of reimbursement;

(b) Generally speaking, across all categories, data was submitted by less than 25 per cent of Member States, which was therefore considered to be unrepresentative of the total number;

(c) There was confusion as to the significance of Member States submitting a zero value to express their acknowledgement and satisfaction that there should be no increase or decrease in the current reimbursement rates. As a result, many Member States did not submit data; this was reflected in the model as "N/A" and therefore had no statistical value.

Position

6. As a result of the above, the Member States supporting the present paper took the following position:

(a) To agree only to a moderate increase in reimbursement rates (not exceeding 1 per cent) this time;

(b) Any increase in reimbursement rates must be accompanied by an agreement by all Member States to make progress with work on the proposal in annex II.B for the refined method of collecting data for the 2007 Working Group on contingent-owned equipment. This additional data should be collected in parallel with the current methodology, but would not negate any other proposals from other Member States to refine or modify the methodology;

(c) Member States should be given the following options when submitting data:

(i) Submit normal data;

(ii) Submit a zero value to express a Member State's satisfaction with the current reimbursement rates; this would therefore affect the statistical analysis, since zero is a value;

(iii) Submit no data, which would be reflected in the model as "N/A". This would, therefore, have no effect on the statistical analysis.

Annex II.B

Recommendation for refinement to the current self-sustainment data-collection methodology

1. A number of Member States presented the following views for refining contingent-owned equipment data collection.

Issue

2. The existing self-sustainment costing data-collection methodology, which was developed during earlier Working Groups on contingent-owned equipment and which continues to be used as the basis for establishing proposed rate changes, does not reflect troop-contributing countries costs in a comparable basis to the current published United Nations self-sustainment rates. Although the data is thorough, it requires an additional calculation by the Member States prior to submission for use during future working groups, to allow it to be compared directly to the current published United Nations self-sustainment rates.

Background and discussion

3. In preparation for the 2004 Working Group on contingent-owned equipment, Member States were requested to provide costing information to the United Nations Secretariat for all self-sustainment categories as part of the triennial review of reimbursement rates. This paper will highlight the current methodology being used for the triennial review, and put forward an additional data-collection methodology for use by future working groups in conducting triennial review on self-sustainment reimbursement rates.

4. In preparing to provide data for the 2004 Working Groups on contingent-owned equipment, it was noted that the direction articulated in the Secretariat's correspondence in May 2003, developed and supported by prior Working Groups, requires Member States to compare national self-sustainment data per category from one period with national self-sustainment data per category from another. In other words, countries have been asked to obtain national self-sustainment data for 31 December 2002 and compare it with similar national data for 1 January 2000, the last year in which a Working Group on contingent-owned equipment was conducted. The two figures are then compared and the percentage difference is documented and submitted to the Secretariat for inclusion with similarly provided data by other Member States.

> *Note*. the existing methodology emphasizes the percentage change between periods without reference to the United Nations rate.

All national figures are then consolidated (averaged), and it is this final figure, reflected in percentage terms, which is provided to the Working Group by the Secretariat and used to assist the Working Group in gauging the percentage of change to be applied to a category.

5. It is important to also provide data that represents current actual Member States' self-sustainment costs that can be compared directly to the current published United Nations rates for the self-sustainment categories. This data must be in a format as per the published United Nations rates, in United States dollars, per person per month for each self-sustainment category. This data would then be used

to compare to the published United Nations self-sustainment rates also published in a United States dollar per person per month figure. As a result, for the 2007 Working Group on contingent-owned equipment, Member States would submit a United States dollar per person per month rate by self-sustainment category (reflecting a nation's actual cost for each category), in addition to the current method of reporting the percentage change as described in paragraph 3 above (e.g. national data change from 1 January 2003 to 31 December 2005).

6. The difference in the current and proposed methodologies is that the existing methodology emphasizes the national percentage price change between periods, and does not quantify the per person per month rate that would be incurred by a nation for providing support to any or all self-sustainment categories. With the additional data provided, the 2007 Working Group will be capable of conducting a true comparison of the two methodologies and ensure possible cost changes are justified during the next Working Group.

7. Of note, this paper is not advocating a wholesale review of the existing approved contingent-owned equipment self-sustainment rates or methodology. Rather, it is the specific methodology with regard to the type of data collected and provided to the next self-sustainment Working Group that should be amended.

Recommendations

8. The following recommendations are put forward to refine current data collection:

(a) Nations should continue to compare national data from the current period with that of another (i.e. data developed for the 2004 Working Group data with national figures prepared for the 2001 post-Phase V Working Group on reimbursement of contingent-owned equipment). See figure 1 below;

(b) Nations should submit to the United Nations actual per person per month figures (in United States dollars) per self-sustainment category at a designated date (not percentage figures). The actual process to create the additional data is as follows:

(i) Each Member State will take their United States dollar figures by item as currently entered by item in the most recent national cost totals figure and divide by the number of persons per contingent (e.g. 700) and then divide by the useful life as decided by each individual Member State in months (e.g. 5 years = 60 months). These figures (now in United States dollars per person per month) are added together for all the serials for each self-sustainment category and will be entered into the index for each category in figure 1, which will represent the actual United States dollar cost per person per month for each separate self-sustainment category. In addition to the cost of equipment, the cost of consumables specifically required to meet the requirements of any self-sustainment category must also be included in the determination of the cost per person per month for that category, that is, on the basis of a total monthly expense, divided by the number of members per contingent;

(ii) For example, in catering, if a country has four refrigerators at $2,625.00 each, the total in column (f) would be $10,500 for this item. This is divided by 700 (assuming 700 men in the Member State contingent), and then divided by 60 (assuming a 5 year = 60 month life expectancy). The calculation would be

($10,500/700)/60 = $.25 cents. The Member State will add all the figures for all the other items listed for this category (catering) and then enter this total United States dollar cost per person per month for each self-sustainment category;

(c) The requirement to provide both sets of data should be implemented in sufficient time (spring 2006) to ensure that both methodologies are used to report data, so that both submissions are available prior to the commencement of the 2007 Working Group;

(d) The United Nations should provide all Member States with a draft list of possible items with the proposed quantities for each separate self-sustainment (and sub-self-sustainment) category, as applicable, to assist all Member States in the creation of the detail to figure 1, to be submitted in the format required (i.e. appendix I to annex B of the United Nations Secretariat instructions) by January 2006.

Conclusion

9. It is clear that Member States value the contingent-owned equipment system, and that it has evolved significantly over time, such that it has become an important and cherished cornerstone of the United Nations peacekeeping process. However, when problems are identified, the community as a whole has a responsibility to ensure that obstacles are overcome in order to safeguard the integrity of the entire process. The present paper will ensure that a transparent and fair system will continue to guide working groups in the quest for justified changes to the contingent-owned equipment self-sustainment rate review process.

Recommended new format

Triennial review of reimbursement rates for self-sustainment

Member State's national cost indices, 1 January 2003 to 31 December 2005

(In United States dollars)

Serial (a)	*Self sustainment category (b)*	*Current published United Nations rate*	*Cost per soldier as at 1 January 2003 (d)*	*Cost per soldier per month as at 31 December 2005 (e)*	*Index percentage (f)=(d)/(d)x100*
1	Catering				
2	Communications:				
	VHF/UHF – FM				
	HF				
	Telephone				
3	Office				
4	Electrical				
5	Minor engineering				
6	Explosive ordnance disposal				
7	Laundry and cleaning				
8	Tentage				
9	Accommodation				
10	Medical, basic				
	Primary and emergency care (clinic)				
	Hospital level medical facility (hospital)				
	High-risk areas (epidemiological)				
	Blood and blood products				
	Laboratory only				
	Dental only				
11	Observation				
	General				
	Night observation				
	Positioning				
12	Identification				
13	Nuclear, biological, chemical protection				
14	Field defence stores				
15	Miscellaneous general stores				
	Bedding				
	Furniture				
	Welfare				

Annex II.C

Frequency of verification reports of the contingent-owned equipment system

Issue

1. The Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions recommended in its report (A/57/772) that the Secretariat provide briefing information and a paper to the 2004 Working Group on Contingent-Owned Equipment on the experience to date in implementing the current cycle for processing verification reports. The Secretariat provided Issue Paper No. 4 and answered Member States' questions. The Secretariat concluded that the current system, calling for monthly verification reports, has not been fully implemented, primarily owing to lack of resources, such as personnel, both specialized and administrative, transport availability, the hardships caused by distance within a number of missions and operational tempo in many missions. In order to implement the monthly system, major additional resources would have to be provided, which, in the Secretariat's view, would not be cost-effective. The Secretariat indicated that the most cost-effective process would be for verification reports to be provided by field missions to United Nations Headquarters on a quarterly basis. The reports would be compiled drawing on the data contained in the standard monthly returns to field mission force headquarters of troop-contributing and police-contributing country contingents, results of spot-check inspections, arrival, quarterly and repatriation inspections and the six monthly operational readiness inspections. This methodology of returns and spot checks, which is currently completed in field missions, would remain.

2. The Secretariat has an existing internal implementation package, which should be used in the training of all contingent specialists who are responsible for the logistics and administrative issues of the respective troop- and police-contributing country contingents in the field mission area. The Secretariat provides the implementation package to the contributing countries when the memorandum of understanding is completed, so that the countries can ensure that the personnel being deployed are acquainted with the verification reporting requirements. It was also established that the Contingent-Owned Equipment Manual should reflect the requirement that the troop- and police-contributing country contingents adhere to the United Nations field mission operational, logistical and administrative standard operating procedures and administrative instructions. A similar reference could also be included in the memorandum of understanding.

Recommendation

3. In the light of the Secretariat's experience and consideration by the Working Group, it is recommended that:

(a) The Working Group agree that, in the future, verification reports should be completed by United Nations field missions and forwarded to United Nations Headquarters on a quarterly basis and contingents should continue to adhere to field mission standard operating procedures in the provision of the respective returns, be they of an operational, logistical or administrative nature, to field mission headquarters;

(b) The Contingent-Owned Equipment Manual be amended to reflect the fact that verification reporting is to be on a quarterly basis and that troop- and police-contributing country contingents must adhere to United Nations field mission operational, logistical and administrative standard operating procedures and administrative instructions.

Annex III.A

Views expressed by one group of Member States

Background

1. The 2004 Working Group on Contingent-Owned Equipment, in its consideration of medical services, dealt basically with two types of issues. The first type was concept-related, that is, the modular concept of medical services, and the second was data-related, which included the review of medical self-sustainment rates.

The present position

2. The Working Group failed to achieve consensus on both issues.

3. The following paragraphs summarize the reasons for this group of Member States' disagreement on the above-mentioned issues.

Concept of modular medical services versus the existing medical services model

4. The troop-contributing countries feel that the existing concept of providing medical services within the framework of levels 1 to 3 should be retained in United Nations peacekeeping operations for the following reasons:

(a) The present system of a three-tiered medical system corresponds to the universally accepted three-tiered logistic system of most armies, particularly those of the troop-contributing countries that are currently providing medical services to the United Nations peacekeeping operations in the field;

(b) The medical staff, the infrastructure, provisioning and procurement mechanisms of these armies are all geared towards providing optimum efficiency under the existing framework of level 1 to 3 hospitals;

(c) The existing medical services framework has been fine-tuned and stabilized over two decades of Peacekeeping Operations. There has never been any deficiency or inadequacy in the system that can be recalled. The system has met all the United Nations standards of equipment and capabilities in all the missions and has served the medical needs of peacekeepers in the field, United Nations and associated personnel and even civilians;

(d) Under the existing system, the memorandum of understanding negotiations are guided by clear-cut models which correspond to level-specific established self-sustainment rates. On the other hand, the modular concept lacks such clarity in self-sustainment rates, which would make memorandum of understanding negotiations complex, cumbersome and opaque and therefore cause confusion and delay;

(e) The modular concept clearly increases the rate at which consumables and medicine is expended, whereas the same increase is not reflected in the self-sustainment rates. This makes the adoption of the modular concept difficult for the troop-contributing countries that currently provide medical services, as doing so would increase their operating costs;

(f) The modular concept was also connected to the self-sustainment rates in a way that the level three rates were to be completely eliminated, but the level 3

services were to be retained, which deprives the troop-contributing countries of the substantial reimbursements that they deserve for those services;

(g) This group of Member States remain, as always, open and flexible to introducing constructive modifications within the existing organizational structure of level 1 to 3 hospitals, particularly with regard to the inclusion of female medical staff on a case-by-case basis.

Annex III.B

Views expressed by another group of Member States

A. Review of the modular medical concept paper submitted by the Secretariat

1. The Working Group agreed to base medical services in the field, as well as the consultations in the Group, on comprehensive medical guidelines, stating the required capabilities in peacekeeping medical facilities. The Working Group discussed the medical guidelines as presented by the Secretariat and with minor amendments, reached consensus on these guidelines (see annexes I and II).

2. The issue of recommended blood supply in the missions was addressed and the Group recommended that a minimal volume should be available to surgical facilities within a maximum of four hours. The volume should be specified by the Medical Support Section of the Department of Peacekeeping Operations.

3. The issue of culturally acceptable services to female troops and staff members in a peacekeeping mission was addressed, and the need for female medical professionals to care for the needs of female staff was emphasized. The Working Group agreed that, as hospital medical care was a United Nations responsibility, a minimum requirement must be that at least one United Nations hospital facility in a mission must offer medical and nursing services to female staff members and troops, including the services of female medical professionals. Provision for female staff in primary and emergency care facilities was a national decision and responsibility.

4. The Working Group discussed the merits of changing the current medical support concept to a modular system. It was agreed that the advantages of a modular system were: (a) flexibility and ability to build a medical facility to meet the specific medical needs of the mission; (b) a more efficient, effective and responsive system; and (c) an enhanced medical capability. The modular system involved the troop-contributing countries at an early stage in the planning process for the medical support to a peacekeeping mission.

5. The changes to the medical support concept were reflected in a change of nomenclature and moving from three levels of medical facilities to two types of facilities, namely the primary and emergency care clinic and hospital care facility. It was emphasized by the Working Group that this should not decrease the total capabilities of the medical care in a peacekeeping mission.

6. There was agreement that the equipment modules presented by the Secretariat responded well to the recommended guidelines, and that they formed a good basis for the development of medical care facilities in peacekeeping missions. As this was a new concept, the modules should be revisited for content by the 2007 Working Group on Contingent-Owned Equipment.

7. The Working Group agreed that the medical staffing levels should not be prescriptive, neither as regards the professional composition, nor in absolute numbers. To this end, minimum staffing levels were recommended for the primary and emergency care clinic (10 medical professionals, with at least one medical doctor) and hospital care facility (50 medical professionals, including the command element). These minimum levels were designed to ensure that optimal medical support could be delivered on a 24-hour-7 days-a-week basis. Increase in staffing

levels to reflect national standards, as well as cultural requirements, could be negotiated through the memorandum of understanding process. As this was a new concept, the numbers should be revisited by the 2007 Working Group on Contingent-Owned Equipment.

8. The new modular medical system should be implemented on 1 July, following ratification of the modular concept by the General Assembly. It was agreed that medical facilities negotiated and deployed after the effective implementation date must be configured, and would be reimbursed, based on the new modular concept and current (2001) generic fair market value figures.

9. The Working Group reached consensus that troop-contributing countries should be given a maximum of 18 months from the implementation date stated in paragraph 13 to enable their medical facilities to provide the capabilities outlined in the modular concept of medical services referred to in paragraph 1 of the present paper. Where this requires an addition of major medical equipment, this should be added to annex B of the memorandum of understanding.

10. Medical facilities negotiated or deployed before the implementation date stated in paragraph 13 should be reimbursed based on the agreed memorandum of understanding and the current (2001) generic fair market value figures until the 2007 Working Group has reviewed the provided figures and made a recommendation on generic fair market value.

11. The Working Group acknowledges that missions that are within three months of their closing date may require separate negotiations with the Secretariat to continue with the present configuration.

B. Review of annexes E-1 (a) and E-1 (b): national cost data for pharmaceuticals

12. The Working Group agreed that the above-mentioned two annexes contained data mainly for the use of the Secretariat in planning a Department of Peacekeeping Operations list of recommended drugs. As they did not relate to the current year's conference, the annexes were not discussed.

C. Review of annex E-2: national cost data for pre-deployment, vaccination and medical self-sustainment

13. Data for pre-deployment vaccination is within the terms of reference of the Troop Cost Sub-Working Group and was not addressed by the medical support services sub-Working Group.

14. Consensus was not reached on the issue of whether sufficient numbers had been made available by the Member States to allow for a revision of the rates. The different views will be presented in separate papers.

15. Consensus was not reached on the issue of which self-sustainment rate should be used for the two levels of medical facilities in peacekeeping missions. The different views will be presented in separate papers.

16. Consensus was not reached on the issue of which medical self-sustainment rates should remain in the Contingent-Owned Equipment Manual. The different views will be presented in separate papers.

17. Consensus was not reached on how to reimburse the cost accrued through deployment of specialist units. The different views will be presented in separate papers.

D. Methodology

18. The Working Group recognized the need for a methodology to be introduced for reviewing the current generic fair market value of medical equipment, as presented in the current (2002) Contingent-Owned Equipment Manual. The generic fair market value should be reviewed in the 2007 Working Group on Contingent-Owned Equipment, since adequate data forming the basis for such review was not presented to the Member States for consideration in due time for the 2004 Working Group.

19. It was agreed that the 2007 Working Group on Contingent-Owned Equipment would endeavour to find a methodology for reviewing the generic fair market value of medical equipment, as well as the medical self-sustainment rate. This would form the framework for such a review. Member States were invited to submit suggested methodology prior to 1 January 2006. It was agreed that the Secretariat would obtain national cost data from Member States covering the period between 2003 and 2005. The Secretariat should collate the national cost data as per 1 January 2006 and make these available to Member States no later than 31 August 2006.

20. It was agreed that the generic fair market value figures should be reviewed so as to reflect the costs of medical equipment as specified by the Medical Support Section of the Department of Peacekeeping Operations, as well as national cost data. The Secretariat should provide clear directions and specific criteria for the submission of national cost data. In addition to national cost data, the Secretariat should make available to Member States the costs of medical equipment in the Department of Peacekeeping Operations systems contract (from international tender).

21. The Working Group agreed that in the future, generic fair market value should reflect the cost of modules, rather than separate line items.

22. The Working Group reached a consensus that the new modular medical system would be reimbursed at the current (2001) generic fair market value figures and would relate to modules and functional units, rather than separate line items. Verification should relate to the presence of a medical capability as stated in the guidelines for medical services referred to in paragraph 1, and should not be concerned with the presence of separate line items.

Annex IV

Troop cost

1. The 2004 Working Group on Contingent-Owned Equipment, in accordance with General Assembly resolution 55/274 of 14 June 2001, was charged with considering the proposed methodology for rates of reimbursement to the Governments of troop-contributing States. For its information, the Working Group considered the report of the Secretary-General (A/57/774).

2. The delegates reaffirmed the following principles contained in document A/9822, dated 30 October 1974, which is when the standard rates of reimbursement were established:

(a) Troops serving side by side should be reimbursed on the same basis for identical services;

(b) No Government should receive a higher reimbursement than its actual costs;

(c) Governments who would not be fully reimbursed based on any standard cost reimbursement formula should be reimbursed at least the amount that was paid to their troops as actual overseas allowance.

3. A number of delegations expressed that the report of the Secretary-General was useful and provided important recommendations. However, a number of delegations expressed that the report did not comprehensively address the requests contained in resolution 55/274.

4. The Working Group considered in greater detail the issues related to the current and proposed methodology in the Secretary-General's report and other issues related to troop-cost methodology.

A. Salary and allowances

5. The issue of basic salary and allowances for service in the home country as a part of the discussion on the cost components in the current and proposed methodology in the report of the Secretary-General was raised.

6. A number of delegations expressed satisfaction with the current composition of the methodology in this respect and expressed their support of the Secretariat's proposal to maintain basic salary and allowances in the calculation of the rate of reimbursement.

7. A number of delegations expressed the view that, since the troop-cost methodology was based on essential additional cost, the need to continue including the basic salary and allowances component should be reviewed.

B. Allowance for the usage of personal clothing

8. No discussion was held on this issue. The Working Group had no objection to the Secretariat's proposal.

C. Pre-post and post-deployment medical costs

9. The Secretariat briefed delegates on the details of paragraphs 20 to 22 of document A/57/774 and clarified the issue of pre-post deployment and the newly proposed post-deployment medical costs; it also clarified again death and disability procedures and the medical components.

10. In discussing the issue, all members agreed that the health of peacekeeping troops is of paramount importance for both the United Nations and the troop-contributing country. The Working Group noted that at present there exist mechanisms for reimbursing troop-contributing countries for death and disability arising from injury or illness contracted by a peacekeeper from participation in a peacekeeping operation. The United Nations does not currently undertake any responsibility to provide for health screening of troops returned to their countries of origin.

11. A number of delegations expressed the view that readying troops for deployment to United Nations peacekeeping operations included ensuring they were in an adequate medical condition to serve, and that this was a national responsibility.

12. A number of delegations expressed the view that, without an effective and efficient verification mechanism, post-deployment medical costs should not be built into the troop-cost reimbursement methodology. Those delegations expressed concern at the fact that the delivery of services for pre-deployment and post-deployment medical costs were unverifiable.

13. A number of delegations agreed with the Secretary-General that the United Nations had a responsibility to return troops from a mission in good health.

14. Those delegations felt that the United Nations should bear the post-deployment medical costs to ensure that troops were returned to their countries in good health and that this should be built into the troop-cost reimbursement rate as proposed by the Secretary-General.

15. A number of other delegations expressed the view that existing practices by troop-contributing countries with respect to verification were adequate for the purpose.

16. A number of delegations questioned the overall effectiveness of maintaining a component for medical costs in the troop-cost methodology.

17. The Chairperson submitted a proposal to include post-deployment medical costs in the troop-cost methodology, based on the provision of a medical examination by a qualified physician, a chest X-ray and the conduct of biochemical tests for illnesses possibly contracted in the field. Under the Chairperson's proposal, reimbursement would be considered only for the technical costs incurred in the provision of those services.

18. A number of delegations who had supported the Secretary-General's proposal with regard to the inclusion of post-deployment medical costs in the methodology, as well as the Chairman's proposal, offered a compromise solution by way of reimbursement through a memorandum of understanding or letter of agreement mechanism.

19. The Working Group was not able to reach consensus regarding the medical cost component of the troop-cost methodology.

Recommendation

No recommendations were made.

D. Travel costs

19. With regard to the cost of passports, some delegations stressed that reimbursement should be limited to the internal administrative costs of issuing passports. The Sub-Working Group discussed the issue and had no objection to the Secretariat's proposal set out in document A/57/774.

E. Peacekeeping-related training costs

20. The Working Group considered all the issues related to pre-deployment training of military contingents. It had an extensive debate, received all the necessary clarification from the Secretariat and agreed that:

(a) General military training and operational skills were a national responsibility;

(b) The Sub-Working Group agreed that adequate pre-deployment training was essential for a soldier to perform his or her specific role of peacekeeper;

(c) The pre-deployment training curriculum consisted of both United Nations standardized generic training modules and mission-specific issues. The guidelines on using standardized generic training modules were provided by the Secretariat, with its implementation in pre-deployment training being a national responsibility;

(d) The Secretariat facilitated the provision of mission-specific training guidelines to troop-contributing countries whenever a new mission was established or when a troop contingent went into operation for the first time. This training was done during the so-called "train-the-trainer courses", which aim to train a core group of officers from the troop-contributing countries and have duration of 5 to 10 days. This core group is responsible for the mission-specific training of the contingent. The "train-the-trainer courses" are funded by the Secretariat under the support account;

(e) The Special Committee on Peacekeeping Operations, in its latest report (A/57/767, para. 102), fully endorsed the establishment of mission training cells and welcomed the bilateral and regional training arrangements between Member States for peacekeeping personnel participating in United Nations peacekeeping operations (ibid., para. 104);

(f) For a number of Member States, taking into account the fact that troop cost is a generic reimbursement and that there seem to be mission-specific training costs yet to be identified by the Secretariat, it is logical that a mission-specific element cannot be a component of a generic reimbursement for troops;

(g) A number of delegations were of the view that training for a United Nations peacekeeping assignment covered a wide range of United Nations-related aspects, which include United Nations-specific operations, language, rules of engagement, riot control, humanitarian actions, civil interaction and mission-specific training. Those delegations were of the view that the cost of imparting training had gone up significantly over the years and that, in view of this, it had

become increasingly difficult for troop-contributing countries to bear this cost alone. Consequently, these delegations felt that troop-contributing countries should be reimbursed adequately for the costs incurred by them in the training of contingents for participating in United Nations missions, especially for mission-specific training, and that the troop-reimbursement rate should contain a component for pre-deployment training, as proposed by the Secretary-General;

(h) The Working Group discussed this issue extensively and listened to the clarifications given by the Secretariat. A number of delegations expressed the view that all training was a national responsibility and that there was no need to include peacekeeping-related training costs as a cost component of the methodology;

(i) Another group of Member States were of the view that mission-specific pre-deployment peacekeeping training costs must be included in the methodology. Some Member States agreed with the inclusion of mission-specific pre-deployment training, but wanted a system of verification of the training. Some Member States wanted an assessment to ensure that the training was done according to United Nations standards, as stipulated in standard generic training module 1. Some Member States needed further clarification on the difference between United Nations generic peacekeeping training and mission-specific training, and on what training or training assistance was required that was not already provided by the United Nations.

21. The members of the Working Group agreed that standardized training was desirable for efficient peacekeeping operations and welcomed the efforts of the Department of Peacekeeping Operations to complete a standardized training manual for peacekeeping operations.

22. A number of delegations expressed the view that costs for mission-specific peacekeeping requirements, such as familiarization training and training materials, should be included, if necessary, in individual peacekeeping mission budgets to ensure standardization, and not in the troop-reimbursement calculation.

23. A number of delegations opposed to the inclusion of direct costs in rates of reimbursement pointed out that, in many cases, the costs for such training had already been absorbed by many Member States which had added peacekeeping to their military doctrine. Including such a cost factor would unfairly reimburse those countries for costs they already absorbed, resulting in overpayment or double payment, which was at odds with the principles of reimbursement. Those delegations also emphasized the need to explore existing bilateral and multilateral initiatives in this regard.

24. The Working Group was unable to reach consensus.

Recommendation

No recommendations were made.

F. Insurance costs

25. No Member States raised the issue of insurance costs.

G. Administrative and miscellaneous costs

26. No Member States raised the issue of administrative and miscellaneous costs.

H. Other issues

27. A number of delegations inquired as to the status of the daily allowance (US$ 1.28) per day per member of the contingent. It was noted that this figure, which had begun as $0.86 in 1958 (A/3839 of 3 July 1958), was now only $1.28. A number of delegations felt that there was a need to revise the allowance, which had remained unchanged for many years.

28. A number of delegations did not feel that this issue was within the mandate of the Working Group and expressed doubt about the necessity to review the allowance.

29. A number of delegations expressed the view that the figure should be reviewed and requested the Secretariat to seek guidance from the General Assembly.